

THE CONSISTENT PROTESTANT;  
OR,  
THE HARMONY OF DIVINE TRUTH ASSERTED;  
BEING  
AN ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,  
ENTITLED,  
THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY STATED;  
IN  
A CIRCULAR LETTER

FROM  
THE BAPTIST-MINISTERS, AND MESSENGERS,  
Assembled at OLNEY, BUCKS, MAY, 28, 29. 1776.

To the several Churches they represent, or have received Letters from,  
meeting at NOTTINGHAM, SHEEPSHEAD, LEICESTER, SUTTON,  
ARNSBY, FOXTON, OAKHAM, SPALDING, SOHAM, KETTERING,  
WALGRAVE, NORTHAMPTON, ROAD, OLNEY, CARLETON, and St.  
ALBANS, &c. &c.

To which are added,

BY WAY OF POSTSCRIPT,  
A few REMARKS ON a late PUBLICATION, entitled,  
HORE SOLITARIÆ;

OR,

ESSAYS UPON SOME REMARKABLE NAMES AND TITLES  
OF JESUS CHRIST.

And also some short Observations on a Treatise  
UPON THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST,  
WRITTEN BY JAMES ABBADIE, D. D.

And now Re-published by the Rev. Mr. ABRAHAM BOOTH.

---

By R. ELLIOT, A. B.  
FORMERLY OF BENNET COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

---

I would have you know, that the HEAD of every Man is CHRIST—and the HEAD  
of Christ is God. 1 Cor. xi. 3.

"I am no Advocate for *implicit faith* in any human determination, or opinion. Should  
I see whole sects, or whole churches, in a glaring error, such as I can prove from scripture  
to be palpably wrong, and of pernicious tendency; I would make no scruple to remon-  
strate, dissent, and enter my protest."

HERVEY's Letters, Vol. I. p. 312.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for the AUTHOR, and sold by J. JOHNSON, St. Paul's Church-  
Yard; and J. MARSON, facing Symonds Inn, Chancery-Lane.



A  
M  
ture  
amon  
beca  
is a  
Syno  
Mon  
thou  
pam  
prob  
the  
deed  
their  
thof  
wou  
pect  
rega  
plain  
told  
" in  
thot  
from  
" a  
" f  
" n  
" e  
both  
they  
quit  
thei  
—  
of M  
sequ  
poi  
rath  
exp

A N

A N S W E R, &c.

MANY, and different are the publications that have lately appeared, on the behalf of what is commonly called, the *orthodox trinitarian hypothesis*; which, as I conceive, is directly repugnant to the scripture character of the ONE SUPREME, *the only living and true God*. But among them all, that which appeared to me the most likely to do mischief, because of the *manner* in which it hath been set forth, and recommended, is a *Circular Letter*; framed, drawn up, and agreed upon, by a modern *Synod*, or assembly of divines; and signed on their behalf, by *Robert Hall*, MODERATOR: this letter was first published in a single sheet, price only 2d; though it has since, in a second edition, swelled almost to the size of a 6d. pamphlet. Had they not found a great demand for them, a *second* edition, 'tis probable, would have never appeared, unless it had been to correct some of the gross errors, or mistakes, which were visible in the *first*. I have not indeed observed, in this letter, any weighty and new arguments in support of their doctrine, but what have been before answered again and again; but those Gentlemen perhaps have not seen these answers, else I think they would not have passed them over in silence: if otherwise, how can they expect that men of understanding, who search and venerate the scripture, will regard their weak sophistry and magisterial dictates, when they are so plainly opposite both to reason and revelation?—But to proceed—We are told in page 2, of the *second* edition, that “the subject of this letter was intended to have been principally of a practical nature.” What induced those Gentlemen to drop their design, and change the subject, we may learn from the following words:—“but observing awful departures from, and artful oppositions made to, the fundamental doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Godhead, we think it our indispensable duty to bear our testimony, in favor of the divine dignity of our gracious Savior, and sanctification.” I have no doubt but these ministers, by their *Circular Letter*, intended both to edify the Church, and to do God service: but, if I mistake not, they have failed in both: for, in my humble opinion, their performance is quite inconsistent with itself, the reasoning fallacious and inconclusive, and their doctrine, upon the whole, very far from agreeing with the scriptures.—And if so, it can neither promote the honor of God, nor the edification of his Church. Yet I mean not to insinuate hereby, nor in any of my subsequent remarks, that the authors of this letter are really deficient either in point of learning or piety. Their *misrepresentations* of the sacred text, I rather impute to their having been too much awed, and led by certain *expeditors*: their *inconsistencies* to the very nature of the *trinitarian hypothesis*.

A

*ests*; and their zeal in the defence of it, to the *prejudices* of education, and the *tradition* of their fathers. I hope, therefore, they will not be offended with my observations on their printed letter \*; for I solemnly declare, that I only mean to write in defence of that doctrine, which I firmly believe to be the truth of scripture; and to oppose *that* only which opposes the truth of God. Allowing then the sacred word to be our common rule and test: let reason examine, let conscience judge, and let the truth prevail.

*Circular Letter.* "The nature of God is incomprehensible: *who by searching can find out God?*—Jehovah is what cannot be explained or illustrated by any creature: in the whole extent of creation, there is no fit resemblance of him.—'Tis unreasonable to object to the truth of a doctrine merely because of its mysterious nature," &c. p. 2.

Ans. The text in Job xi. 7. is foreign to the point in question; it says nothing of the nature of God, nor doth it respect the mode of his existence: it only sets forth and declares his unsearchable wisdom and righteousness, as the God of providence, and as the moral governor of the world.

2. If there be "no fit resemblance of JEHOVAH," as these divines tell us, how can it, with truth, be affirmed, that JEHOVAH, the LIVING God, created man *in his own image*? Certainly the image of a thing is the resemblance of it. Though the *self-existence*, and *immutability* of JEHOVAH, cannot be resembled by any other being: yet as an intelligent spirit, and in his moral perfections, JEHOVAH may be, and is resembled; and as man is declared to be the *image* and *glory* of God, he is certainly a *resemblance* of God, see Gen. i. 27. 1 Cor. xi. 7. Eph. iv. 24. We are likewise told, that *God is a Spirit*, and the Father of spirits; those spirits, therefore, of whom he is the Father, must needs be a resemblance of him. And a resemblance may be *fit* and proper, though it be not absolutely perfect, nor in all respects equal to the GREAT ORIGINAL. Therefore your *preliminary* doctrine hath nothing to support it, either from reason or revelation.

3. We do not object to the truth of any doctrine *merely* because of its mysterious nature, we only object to the *mysteries* of human invention, which the divine word hath not revealed, and which the reason of man hath never been able to demonstrate.

C. L. "In the doctrine we plead for there is nothing absurd, we do not say that God is *one* in the same sense in which he is *three*; nor *three* in the same sense in which he is *one*," &c. p. 3.

Ans. If your doctrine contradict itself, it is allowed to be absurd; and that it doth so, is, to me, plain and evident: for you say, there is but one God, in whom there are three co-equal persons, who constitute that one God: yet at the same time you maintain that *each* of these persons is by

\* This Letter hath been reviewed in the *Gospel Magazine*, for October and November 1776, where it is recommended in the strongest terms: "The reasonings are said to be clear and masterly, the arguments adduced, in demonstration of Christ's absolute and proper Deity, irrefragable," &c. &c. I must own, that the whole performance appears to me in quite a different light; therefore one of us must certainly be mistaken. Some of the capital errors of the *first* edition are indeed corrected in the *second*; but as the Editor hath neglected to acknowledge it, therefore I inform those who may have only seen the first, that the change of the word *God* for *Lord*, in Psalm xlv. 11. is now altered; and the addition to Deut. vi. 4. with their gloss upon it, is entirely expunged. But though the *review* of this Letter seems to have been made from the *first* edition, not the least notice is taken of those errors, which the authors themselves have since corrected: was not this a culpable neglect in the author of the review? or to what shall we impute it? to an extraordinary candor—or an oversight? Persons who undertake to give characters of other men's writings, ought, in my opinion, to be more than commonly *diligent, impartial, and humble*.



*himself* true and *perfect* God; and is, as such, to be *distinctly* worshipped: consequently, you make the DIVINE BEING to be both one God, and three Gods: and if this be not a palpable contradiction, inconsistent and absurd, nothing, I think, deserves the name. The inconsistency I own is unavoidable, in order to make your doctrine comport with an inconsistent hypothesis: but why then will you persist in attempting to defend that which is indefensible? But if God, indeed, be three persons, as you tell us, then neither of the persons, *by himself*, is the true God; nor ought the Deity ever to be addressed in the *singular* number, but always in the *plural* \*. For what can be plainer than this? if each of the persons, *by himself*, be the true God, it certainly follows there must be as many Gods, as there are persons. Again; if it be allowed (and what christian will deny it?), that the TRUE God cannot be approached, and served acceptably, *without a Mediator*: then all those christians do plainly acknowledge and avow *that* person; and *him only* to be the TRUE God, whom they daily approach, and worship *by a Mediator*: and where are those christians to be found who presume *thus* to worship any person except the FATHER *only*? And on the other hand, when they call upon, or worship any other person without a mediator, they *practically* declare that they disallow, and do not believe that person to be the true God.—The contrary may be pretended; but a man's solemn addresses to the Majesty of heaven, are much more to be regarded as the true meaning and index of his heart, than the words with which, at other times, he addresses his fellow mortals: especially when those words are, by himself, constantly denied and contradicted, in his most solemn and religious duties.

I infer, therefore, that Christ, the *true* and *only Mediator* between God and men, never was, nor is, nor can possibly be, the true God; for the true God is ABSOLUTELY SUPREME, *impassible* and *immutable*: and on the other hand, that person, even the FATHER of *Christ*, who *alone*, according to the scriptures, is always addressed, and worshipped, by and thro' the one mediator Jesus Christ; HE, I say, even the FATHER, *ever was*, and *is*, and *ever will be*, the *only living* and *true* God, "for with the TRUE God there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

C. L. "By person, we understand an *intelligent agent*, or one that acts "with will, *understanding* and *design*; not adhering to another (which is "the idea of a property), nor a part of another (as the body or soul is a "part of a man); but having a real subsistence, by which it is distinguished "from every other," p. 4.

Ans. This definition appears to me, as though it were framed, and designed, both to perplex and deceive the reader, for, in my opinion, it is neither clear nor just; for in the first place, every thing that *adheres* to another is not a bare property; for one person may adhere, unite, or cleave to another person; which this definition denies.

2. The *rational spirit*, or soul of man, is "an intelligent agent," or "one that acts with will, understanding, and design," which powers the soul possesses independent of the body.—When the apostle saith, "I knew "a man in Christ, whether *in the body*, or *out of the body*, I cannot tell." he plainly regards, and speaks of his rational spirit as the man, and as a proper person, without the body †. Now as a person is allowed to be an *intelligent*

\* See this point more fully argued, in a letter to Mr. Romaine, p. 64, 65.

† The scripture considers the body as a *clothing*, house, or *tabernacle*, in which the soul, that is, the man, dwells, 2 Cor. v. 1—8. 2 Pet. i. 13, 14. and also as a *medium* or *instrument* by which the soul generally receives impressions from, and acts towards other Beings, Rom. vi. 13, 14. James iii. 1, 9. and as the body natural is suited to these various

*intelligent agent*, and the whole of man, *as intelligent*, is comprehended in the rational soul; doth it not follow, by a necessary consequence, that personality is to be referred to the spirit alone, without the body? In my opinion, therefore, a proper person is *one single intelligent Being*, or spirit; and whether this spirit be clothed or naked, with or without a body, and whether the body it wears be natural or spiritual, the SPIRIT alone is the person † (for that only is intelligent), and this *intelligent spirit* is the same *identical person* in all places, and in all conditions whatever.—Now which of the two definitions be most agreeable to scripture, and the common understanding of men, I leave the judicious reader to determine.

C. L. "By a BEING, we understand *oneness* or *unity of existence*," p. 4.

Ans. This definition is, I think, vague and obscure:—if it mean that an intelligent being exists not in a plurality, but in a unity of person, there is sense and meaning in it, though it be improperly expressed; but if it only mean that a *being*, is but *one being*, and not two or three; 'tis a dark way of telling us what no-body ever denied. A Being properly means that which exists, and is only opposed to a mere non-entity, or that which hath no existence. By an intelligent Being, we always understand one *philosophical* or *proper PERSON*, and no more.

C. L. "The WORD was made flesh;—by flesh, which he was made, is intended man, or the whole of human nature; hence *flesh* and *man* are used as convertible terms, as in Deut. v. 26, &c." p. 5.

Ans. The term *flesh* is used by the scripture in various senses, and very often means the human body, or earthly part of man, as distinguished from, and opposed to his rational spirit, see Matt. xxvi. 41. Rom. vii. 25. viii. 10—13. 1 Cor. v. 3, 5. vi. 16, 20. 2 Cor. vii. 1. But you have concealed this, and assert, without any limitation or exception, that "*flesh*" and *man* are convertible terms," whereas man is only so called by a *figure*; for properly speaking, his body only is flesh.

2. The word *flesh* first occurs in Gen. ii. 21—24. where it evidently means not the whole of man, but the body only: and had man never sinned, I am persuaded, he would never have been called flesh. But since the fall he is frequently so called; and that because the *spirit*, his nobler part, is now become a willing slave to its inordinate lusts and appetites; and hence it is said, "they that are in the flesh," i. e. those whose minds are led and governed by the desires and lusts of the flesh, "cannot please God." Men, therefore, who only mind, and seek after carnal and earthly things, are, *by a figure*, termed flesh; even as men of a crafty, cruel, and mischievous spirit are called lions, wolves, vipers, &c. but the man Christ Jesus, in whom was no sin, is, I believe, nowhere called flesh, by the inspired writers; for it is evident from scripture, that the flesh of Christ means his proper human body, and is set in direct opposition to his rational soul: therefore speaking of the resurrection of Christ, he saith, "that his *soul* was not left in hell, neither his *flesh* did see corruption," Acts ii. 31. see also Rom. i. 3. Heb. ii. 14. x. 5, 10. Nor do I remember that the saints are ever called flesh; because, though they walk in the flesh, i. e. in the body, they do not war after the flesh, to fulfil the lusts of it, 2 Cor. x. 3.

C. L. "When Christ said, *my Father is greater than I*; this does not "prove his inferiority as a person; for his humanity is not a person—

uses and purposes for the soul's benefit and advantage in this world; so I doubt not, when changed and made spiritual, it will be fitted and adapted to similar uses and purposes in the world to come; therefore the glory and happiness of saints departed is not complete till the resurrection. and hence they are said to wait for the redemption of their bodies.

† The word PERSON commonly signifies, one single, intelligent, voluntary agent, or conscious being." *Douglas*.

" it never had a distinct subsistence of its own for a moment.—therefore  
 " it is called, *that holy thing*, Luke i. 35," p. 5, 6.

Ans. The personal pronoun *I*, in this text, is, I think, a clear proof that Christ speaks of himself as a *person*: this yourselves in other places, not only acknowledge, but maintain; and by denying it here you seem not only to contradict the scriptures, but yourselves likewise. If the human nature never had a *distinct* subsistence of its own, it never subsisted at all, for though the human nature be intimately united to, and from the first moment of its existence subsisted in the divine, yet the human nature hath, and ever must have a real subsistence of its own, *distinct* from the divine nature; this I think cannot be denied without *confounding* the two natures, or making the *human* to be absorbed, and even *annihilated* by the *divine*.—The word *wasidor*, *child*, is evidently understood in Luke i. 35. and so it might have been rendered, *that holy child*, see Matt. ii. 13.—Is *that* which is said to be born of God, in 1 John v. 4. no proper person, because it is expressed in the neuter gender? the contrary is evident from the very next verse; "*who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?*"

2. FATHER and SON are *correlates*, therefore when Christ saith, "My Father is greater than I," his words plainly declare, and undoubtedly mean, that the Father, *as a person*, was greater than the Son, *as a person*: nor can the words, I think, be expounded or understood, consistent with reason and truth, to mean any thing else: but according to the gloss of these Gentlemen, Christ bid his disciples to rejoice that he was going to the Father, for the eternal Father was greater than that part of his Son, which was no person, even greater than his flesh. How wretchedly do some teachers abuse, and pervert the plainest words of scripture! yet these very divines presently add, "*who ever thought humanity equal to Deity?*" If such a thought be absurd, what wisdom is there in denying it? or what necessity was there for it? and yet this is all the meaning which they put upon our Lord's words; that is to say, he told his disciples, the *Deity* was greater than his *humanity*. Thus they make him solemnly to teach his disciples, what no body ever denied, and consequently to trifle with them. "O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Isa. iii. 12.

C. L. "Considering Christ as *God-man*, invested with office capacity, he is represented as a servant, though he was a Son, and as such did nothing of himself, but received commandment what he should say and do," p. 6.

Ans. You have here represented Christ, as *GOD-MAN bearing an office*: but as I do not find that the apostles have any-where delivered or taught this doctrine, I cannot but reject it, as a mere *human tenet*, and as the *conjectural notion* of such men, who have presumed to be wise above what is written.

2. None but a *proper person* can bear an office, and you have already declared that the humanity of Christ is no person; it follows, therefore, according to your doctrine, that Christ was anointed, became a servant, and obeyed, not as a human, but as a divine person, i. e. as God: that this is your meaning is, I think, further manifest from the following words, for "it is allowed, you say, that a servant acts in a *subordinate* capacity, but it cannot be from thence inferred that he is of an *inferior nature*." Consequently you make the nature which was *anointed*, and acted as a servant, not to be *human* but *divine*. Can this be reconciled with the immutability of God? or can the *DEITY* indeed stand in need of help, or become a servant to himself? How unlike is your doctrine to that of the holy prophets and apostles? Therefore,



3. You make the divine nature *in the person of the Son*, to be *actually inferior* to the same divine nature *in the person of the FATHER*; for if he bear an office under him, he must not only be appointed by him, but be also inferior to him; "for without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better."

4. As *he that appoints* another to an office, and gives him commandments, cannot be the *very same Being* with him that is appointed, and that receives commandments from him; therefore also you make the Father and the Son to be two several Beings, perfectly distinct each from other, so that one is not the other; consequently they cannot be one and the same God. Is not your doctrine then the very substance and spirit of what is commonly called Arianism? I think it is, for you plainly make two distinct Gods, a greater and a less.

5. You say, likewise, that Christ, "*as God-man*, invested with office, did nothing of himself;" consequently none of the divine works and miracles, which he wrought, were done by his own power, but must be referred to some other person, that is, to the Father (which by the way overturns your whole system), though by-and-by you will contradict and deny it all; "But if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor." But,

6. We, on the other hand, believe and maintain, that the human nature, even the man Christ Jesus, is he who was anointed of God, and acted as a servant to his Father, and therefore he put his own Spirit upon him, that he might not fail nor be discouraged until he had set judgment in the earth, see 1 Tim. ii. 5. 1 Cor. xv. 21. Acts xvii. 31. In the first of these texts the apostle hath plainly pointed out and testified the true and proper distinction between the *one God* and the *one Mediator*, who is expressly declared to be the man Christ Jesus.—In the second text, the opposition between the *first man* and the *second* is so direct and express, that it cannot be interpreted of any other being, but of a man only, without making the apostle's reasoning weak and absurd:—and in the last it is so manifest, that it cannot be understood of a divine person, i. e. of the true God, without running into the horrid blasphemy of saying, that God raised God from the dead.

C. L. "*Who being in the form of God*, &c. Phil. ii.—If the *likeness* of men, and the *form* of a servant, denote that he was truly man, and really obeyed, what reason can be assigned why the *form of God*, does not intend his possessing a nature properly divine, especially as it is asserted, *he thought it no robbery to be equal with God*?—Yet, amazing confession! he who was equally God, became man,—obeyed and dyed," p. 6, 7.

Ans. Though these ministers here assert, that he who was equally God, by which they mean God himself, *became man* and *died*; yet I hope they did not intend what their words declare, for their trumpet will soon give a very different sound—that he who was in the *form of God*, became incarnate, obeyed, and dyed, is certain; but what man of real religion and in his right mind, will dare affirm, or even imagine, that the *LIVING God became man*, and *died*?

2. Christ, we are assured, was made in the *likeness* of sinful flesh; but was he therefore *sinful flesh*, because he was made in the likeness of it? Certainly not. His appearing in the *form*, and doing the work of a servant, is no proof of his being a servant, in the strict and proper sense of the term; for a son and heir may assume the habit, do the work, and act in the character of a servant, but he is not therefore a proper servant; for a son is not a servant, neither is a servant a son; "Thou art no more a servant, but a son."—"The servant abideth not in the house for ever, but the son



"abideth ever."—"Moses was faithful as a *servant* in the house of God, but Christ as a *Son*."—"Though he were a *Son*, yet learned he obedience." As then his being in the *form* of a servant, does not mean that he really was a servant, but that he appeared only in a servant's form, that is, in the likeness of sinful men, and acted in our stead: so likewise his being in the *form* of God, does not mean that he was *really* that God whose form he bore; but it declares only, that, before his incarnation, he existed, and appeared in the *form* or *similitude* of JEHOVAH, representing God, and acting in his stead. And doubtless this is he whom Moses saw, for JEHOVAH the LIVING GOD, he did not, nor could see; compare Exod. xxxiii. 20, 23. with Numb. xii. 8.

3. The word *μορφή*, *form*, properly denotes *figure, shape, resemblance*, or outward appearance †; but I believe never means *abstract nature*, or essence. 'Tis likewise evident from the context, that the person who came from heaven, is the very same who suffered in the flesh for sinners, and is the same also whom God hath highly exalted; even as Joseph, his *type*, was the same person both in his father's house, and in the dungeon, and when he was afterwards exalted, and made ruler over all the land of Egypt; yet he was not therefore Pharaoh, nor absolutely equal with him; for Pharaoh still held the reins of government, and in the throne was greater than Joseph.

4. I don't find that Christ ever said he was equal to God, and therefore I am persuaded he never thought it. That the apostle's words are not so to be understood, is evident from the scope of the whole passage, and hath, I think, been clearly proved by many able critics, and expositors. The *form* of God indeed denotes *resemblance* and *likeness*, but not a *proper equality* with him. And it seems to me impossible for the true God to divest himself of his *essential form*, and glory—God cannot *lie*, neither can he *change*; perhaps for this reason he said to Moses, "Thou canst not see my face, for no man shall see me and live." But Christ, who pre-existed in the form of God, *actually* divested himself of that glory, and took on him the form of a servant; for looking not on his own things (namely, the glory which he then had with his Father) but on the things of others (that is, the misery of the church), his heart was not so set on the glory which he then possessed, as to count it the most *eligible prize*, to retain the possession of it, *by himself alone*, without the church; but "his delights were with the sons of men:" therefore to do his Father's will, and for their sakes whom the Father had given him, he chose rather to divest himself of that glory, and to take flesh, and to die for them. Thus he manifested, at the same time, his great and matchless love to God the Father, and also to the church; which he thereby redeemed and *purchased with his own blood*: wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, &c. That this is the plain scope and sense of the passage, is to me clear and certain.

C. L. "If Christ is called *the Son of man*, on account of his having real humanity, his being called *the Son of God*, is an equal proof of his true divinity," p. 7.

Ans. Though the former part of this sentence be allowed, the latter would not necessarily follow; for, by the same kind of analogy, it may, with more propriety, be argued thus: If Christ be called the Son of God, because God was his *divine* Father; his being called the Son of man, is an equal proof of his having had a *human* father; but though the former is true, the latter is false, for he was born of a virgin: Christ was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; but it is not likewise said that he was made or begotten of the substance of God, accord-

† See Divine Revelation, p. 83—87.

ing to the Spirit, but that he was *declared* to be the Son of God, &c. and by *flesh* is undoubtedly meant a human body which God had prepared for his Son, that being in all things made like unto his brethren, he might therein obey and suffer for them, and thus reconcile us unto God, *in the body of his flesh*, through death, see Col. i. 22. Heb. x. 5, 10, 20. and if by the term *Son of man* (which is a title of the MESSIAH, compare Psalm viii. 4, 5, 6. with Heb. ii. 6—9), we are to understand the mere human nature, or man Christ Jesus; then Christ, as man, is the true Son of God, the anointed Savior of the world: and this I think is manifest from the following scriptures; “The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.”—“Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? Thou art Christ the Son of the living God.”—“The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.”—“The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father.” The scripture abounds with this language; from whence ’tis certain that the man Christ is both in *nature*, and in *person*, no other than the Son of the living God.

C. L. “Christ is often declared to be the Son of God,—his only begotten &c. and it is evident a Son is a distinct person from the Father, and yet of the same nature with him,” p. 7.

Ans. The scripture commands us to believe on Jesus, and to confess, and teach him as the *Christ* and *Son of God*; but that he is of the *same nature with God*, I do not find the scripture any where saith it, or bids us believe any thing about it. But if we may be allowed to form conjectures, concerning his *proper nature* and essence, I know of no passage that will afford us more light and satisfaction in this matter than Heb. ii. 11. for we are there told, that “*he* (Christ) who sanctifieth, and *they* (the church) who are sanctified, are both of one,” i. e. of one FATHER; and consequently are both of the *same or like nature*: that this is the sense in which they are said to be *both of one*, is, I think, evident from the very next words, “for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren;” and again he adds, “it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren;” and they are *so* his brethren, that *they* also are sons and heirs of God, and *joint-heirs* with Christ, Rom. viii. 17. But if *brethren* and *co-heirs* are not of *one* and the *same*, or *like nature*; it can never be proved that *father* and *son* are of the *same or like nature*: therefore if Christ be of the *same nature* with God the Father, so are his brethren likewise. But Christ, it will be said, is the *only begotten* of the Father; we readily allow it: but what then? Doth this declare that the nature of Christ is any thing different from that of his brethren? By no means. Was not Ishmael of the *same or like nature* with Abraham his Father, as well as Isaac? yet Isaac is called his *only begotten*, Heb. xi. 17. therefore it seems reasonable to believe that the term *only begotten*, doth not relate to any *difference of nature* between Christ and his brethren, but to some other circumstance. Christ is likewise the *brightness* of the Father’s glory, and the *express image* of his person; but neither doth this declare that the *nature* of Christ is *unlike*, or different from that of his brethren, because *they* also are declared to be the *image* and *glory* of God: therefore ’tis most reasonable to suppose, that the terms *express image*, and *image*; *brightness of glory*, and *glory*, do not declare a *difference of nature*, but only *different degrees* of perfection and glory, of one and the same nature, as subsisting in Christ, and in the saints his brethren. And whereas Christ, as well as his brethren, is God’s heir, surely he is not *THAT* God, whose *heir* he is.

C. L. "He (Christ) bestowed a spiritual capacity, which none but God could do—we know that the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding—this is the true God," &c. p. 8.

Answ. God gives his Spirit, and spiritual gifts, unto men, *by the medium and ministration of men*—"Through laying on of the apostle's hands the holy Spirit was given," Acts viii. 17. 18. "When Paul had laid his hands on them, the holy Spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied," Acts xix. 6. see 2 Tim. i. 6. The divine order is plainly this; Christ first received the Spirit from God, and afterwards the apostles, from Christ. Therefore the person ministering the Spirit is not the true God.

2. The true God, mentioned in 1 John v. 20, is not the Son but the Father, whom the Son hath made known to us, as is evident from the preceding verse, and from other scriptures, "he that sent me is true," John vii. 28. "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God," xvii. 3. see also chap. i. 18. xvi. 25. The proper antecedent to *υπο* is not *ο υιος* but *ο αληθινος, θς*; being understood: in the same manner, as *Θς* not *αγνς* is the antecedent to *αυτου*, Rev. xxii. 3. which, as in the former passage, is clear and certain, by comparing the next verse with chap. iii. 12. and xiv. 1. 'tis well known also that the *substantive immediately preceding* is not always the proper antecedent to the relative: therefore your arguing from this text proves nothing; moreover 'tis plain, that the word *even* is improperly supplied, also the preposition *in* may as well be rendered *by* or *through*; And besides all this, your interpretation of the text makes the passage void of sense and meaning: for according to your gloss, it must run thus; 'The Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding to know him (the Son) who is true, and we are in him (the Son) who is true, even in his Son,' &c. thus you make the Son, to be the Son of himself: which is an absurdity that the scripture abhors—therefore 'tis certain that the *subject* of the text, of whom the apostle speaks, and whom the Son hath given us to know, is not himself, but the Father; who therefore is here declared to be the true God, in perfect harmony with the other scriptures.—No man knoweth who the FATHER is; but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.

C. L. "Christ is possessor of divine personal properties, as infinite, unlimited understanding, &c. "Lord thou knowest all things," John xxi. 17. To search the heart is peculiar to God. "Thou only knowest the hearts of the children of men," 2 Chron. vi. 30. Jesus knew what was in man—all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts, Rev. ii. 23." p. 7.

Answ. The word *all* is often used in a limited and restrained sense—"ye (believers) know all things," 1 John ii. 20. "My Lord (David) is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth," 2 Sam. xiv. 20.

2 There was a time when Christ, the Son of God, had not the universal knowledge of all things; this himself hath told us, with his own mouth, see Matt. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32. And I hope these divines will not pretend to know the extent of Christ's knowledge better than he knew it himself. But perhaps they will say, that Christ there spake of himself as *man* or *mediator*; and that he meant his *human nature* (which in the judgment of these divines is no person): To this I answer, whatever nature Christ spake of, 'tis certain that he spake of himself as a person; for with what propriety, can it be said of a nature, which is no person, that it did not know the day of judgment; but if Christ had known it in any nature, as a person, he could not, with truth, be said not to know it:—



but the Son of God is truth, and cannot lie, therefore he knew it not in any nature, no not as a divine person. But further; it is quite clear and certain, that Christ, in the passage before us, not only speaks of himself *as a person*, but as a person in his *highest capacity*: this is evident from the very order of the *climax*, or gradation, by which our Lord ascends from the less to the greater: for he saith, "of that day, and hour, knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the FATHER only;" therefore he speaks of himself as a Being, higher than the angels, and yet excepts himself, as well as they. These words then, in my opinion, contain a direct testimony, from Christ's own mouth, that there is but one divine person *absolutely omniscient*, and that person is the Father. And whereas our Lord has mentioned every kind of intelligent agents, or *persons*, both in heaven and earth, and says not a word of the holy Spirit; may we not from hence reasonably infer, that the Spirit is no proper person? This I think cannot be gain-sayed without denying the *propriety* and truth of Christ's testimony, or else making the Spirit a very *inferior being*. Again, how and by what means the Son of God came to know all things, and to know the hearts of men, himself likewise hath plainly told us; "The Father, saith he, loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things which himself doth," John v. 20. so that 'tis certain he receives his knowledge from the Father; and therefore he saith again, "As my Father hath taught me I speak these things," John viii. 28. Thus, "*when Jesus perceived, in his spirit, that they so reasoned within themselves, he said,*" &c. Mark ii. 8. do not these words plainly intimate, that the Father, who dwelt in Christ, shewed him what these men were reasoning in their hearts? and hence he saith again, "whatsoever I speak therefore, as the FATHER said unto me so I speak," John xii. 50.

The text in 2 Chron. vi. 30. compared with 1 Kings viii. 39. speaks of *one single person*, and of *one only*; consequently the ability to search the heart, there mentioned, cannot, with truth, be affirmed of any other person whatever, except he receive it, as a *gift*, from him of whom that text speaks; but the person of whom the text speaks, who gives to all and receives from none, is God the Father: nor can any one deny this, without denying the Father himself to be omniscient; for the text in plain and direct terms asserts, that one person, even *one only*, searches and knows the hearts of the children of men.

But the text in Rev. ii. 23. speaks not of the Father, but of the Son; therefore these texts cannot be reconciled, unless the Son be supposed to receive that power, and ability, to search the hearts, from the Father; but if this be admitted, then the texts are easily reconciled, and perfectly agree also with the other scriptures, see Isa. xi. 2—4. Matt. xi. 27. Rev. i. 1.—But this is far more evident yet, for Christ, in that very text, speaks of himself as judge of the world: and the scripture is plain and express in declaring that God the FATHER hath appointed Christ to be the judge of quick and dead; and will judge the *secrets*, or hearts of men by him; therefore 'tis fit and necessary that he should both *search* and *know* their hearts—and as God hath given this perfection of knowledge, wisdom and power to Christ only, see John v. 22, 27. Acts x. 42. xvii. 31. Therefore he saith, "all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth," &c. But further: that this ability, power and authority, to search the hearts, and rule and judge the children of men, was *given* to Christ, by the Father, himself hath plainly declared in verse 27. "Even, saith he, as I received of my Father:" And who ever denies that the Father could give this immense knowledge and power



power unto the Son, must, at the same time, deny the FATHER *himself* to be *omniscient* and *omnipotent*: but that the FATHER hath done, and doth this, by giving to the Son his own Spirit, and that *without measure*, appears plain from its being added, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." Thus the SON and WORD of GOD, is quick and powerful—is a *discerner* of the *thoughts* and intents of the heart, for *all things* are naked and *opened*\* (i. e. by the Father) unto the eyes of *him*, i. e. of Christ his Son, *to whom we must give an account*†. God therefore hath laid open the most secret recesses of every heart, before the eyes of him, whom he hath constituted and appointed the judge of quick and dead; as will fully appear at that day, *when God shall judge the secrets of men by JESUS CHRIST, according to Paul's gospel*, Rom. ii. 16.

C. L. "He (Christ) is a person possess of infinite power by which he upholdeth all things, Heb. i. 3. He is therefore called the "mighty God, Isa. ix. 6. The *most mighty*, Psalm xlv. 3. And him—"hath proclaimed this truth, as with the voice of a great trumpet, saying, I am—the Almighty, Rev. i. 8. Devils tremble before him," &c. p. 8.

Ans. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *the Son can do nothing of HIMSELF*"—And again he saith, "I can *of my own self* do nothing, John v. 19, 20. "But the FATHER who dwelleth in me, *he* doth the "works." xiv. 10. and it evidently appears, from the fifth and twelve following chapters of this evangelist, that the power whereby Christ was able to *quicken* and raise the dead, and his authority to judge the world, were *gifts* and *honors* conferred on him by his FATHER—Neither doth he here, or any where else, give us the least intimation of his person being *composed*, or compounded of *two different natures*, one *weak* and *human*; the other *omnipotent* and *divine*: he no-where saith, *as man*, I know nothing, and can do nothing; but, *as God*, I am omniscient and omnipotent: but *vain* men have invented this distinction for him, tho' Christ himself hath no where taught, or commanded it; and if Christ in the above texts did not speak of himself, as a proper person, no words can possibly declare his true and proper personality; how strongly is it marked, how plain and full are the terms whereby he declares it—I say, the Son of *himself*; and again, *I of myself*, can do nothing.

2. No name given to Christ, as IMMANUEL, the MIGHTY GOD, &c. is any proof of his being *that* GOD, or that DIVINE BEING, whose name he bears—Christ is often called DAVID, was he therefore the very same *identical* person, or *Being*, with David? certainly not. In the prophet Malachi, JOHN the BAPTIST is expressly called ELIJAH the *prophet*, and is promised by that name and character, but was he therefore that very ELIJAH? he saith, I am not, John i. 21. and it was a fatal mistake of the Jews to reject the Baptist as the immediate harbinger of Christ, because he was not the very person of Elijah. Why then, it may be said, was he promised by that name? we are told by the angel, because he was to come "in the spirit and power of ELIJAH," Luke i. 17. A person, therefore, who comes in the spirit and power of another, may be called by his name, though he be not that *Being* whose name he bears. *Moses* was called *God*; but with much greater propriety may Christ be so called, who came in the fulness of the Spirit and power of God, having the FATHER ever *with* him, and dwelling *in* him.

\* *Τετραχρηστα*, not open, but *opened*, that is, laid open for his inspection.

† Is not this the true meaning of the Greek phrase, *προς ον ημεις ο λογος*;

3 From *אל נבחר* rendered in Isa. ix. 6. the MIGHTY GOD, is formed the proper name *Gabriel*, which signifies the *God of my strength*, or the *strong God*. Is the angel GABRIEL therefore the mighty or strong God, or was ELISHA, the *salvation of God*, or ELIJAH, *God the Lord*? because their names, *being interpreted*, have that meaning? Certainly not. Therefore from the names *given* to the MESSIAH, the Son of the virgin, and the Son of God; it cannot be reasonably inferred, nor proved, that the Son is *that God* whose name is called upon him. Moreover the name of God in the Old Testament, is given both to angels and men, because, as rulers and judges, God had appointed them to represent him, and to act in his stead; or else to declare some eminent work which God had done, or intended to do by them, see Exod. iv. 16. vii. 1. xxii. 28. Psalm lxxxii. 1, 6. xcvi. 7. But on all these accounts the anointed Savior and appointed Judge of the world, may, with much greater propriety, be called *God*.—The word *moß*, Psalm xlv. 3. is not in the *Hebrew* text, 'tis added by the translators, nor do I suppose that these Gentlemen were ignorant of it: yet they have urged it again and again, and laid some considerable stress upon it—A bad shift is better than none—But had they not been in great want of scripture texts for the support of their doctrine, they would never, I think, have cited this, as a corroborating evidence and *proof* of it: for the *original* word means no more than a *mighty one*, or a *strong man*, the very same word that is rendered *mighty man*, Isa. iii. 2.

4. By whose power Christ raised the dead, cast out devils, and upholds all things, both himself and his apostles have plainly and often told us, whether men believe them or not. see Matt. xii. 28. xxviii. 18. Acts ii. 22. x. 38. Therefore he who is declared to be the Almighty, Rev. i. 8. is plainly not the *Son* but the *Father*, as is evident, by comparing it with verse 4. nor can this be denied, without contradicting the other scriptures. See Mark xiv. 36. John xi. 40, 41. Heb. v. 7. Eph. i. 19, 20.

C. L. "The blood of the sin-atoning sacrifice, which, as a priest, he (Christ) offered for the pacifying offended justice, is called the blood of God, Acts xx. 28. it is blood divine, as the *nature offered* as a sacrifice, was in *union* with the Son of God, *from hence arose its value, and virtue* to purchase, and purify," p. 8, 9.

Ans. All the *seeming* difficulty of this text will vanish by admitting the *Syriac version*, which reads it thus, "*seed the church of CHRIST* which," &c. or the reading of another *Greek copy*, which has it, "*seed the church of God, which he purchased with the blood of his own* (Son):" both which are more agreeable to the general language of the New Testament, than the common reading, and are therefore to be preferred to it. The celebrated Mr. John Knox seems to have understood it thus; for we are told, that a little before his death, in a solemn address and charge to the ministers of Edinburgh, he said; "Look diligently to the flocks with whose oversight God hath intrusted you, and which he hath redeemed to himself, *by the blood of his Son*."

2: If, as these Gentlemen assert, the blood of the human nature is called the blood of God, and is blood divine *because it was united to a divine person*, surely it may with equal truth and propriety be affirmed, that the man Christ is called God, and is a divine person, not because he is God, but because he is in *union* with God; \* the consequence is

\* According to the reasoning of these Ministers, the Word in John i. 1. may be called God because he was in union with him, though he be not that God with whom he was. See this text explained at large, in *Sacred Controversy*, p. 15.—25.

obvious and undeniable—These divines had told us before, that *he* who was *equal* with God, *became man*, and *died*; see page 6, but here they preach a very different doctrine, for now they tell us, it was *another nature*, in *union* with the Son of God, that *suffered*: such inconsistencies not only discover the unsettledness of their own minds, but evidently tend also to perplex, and confound the weak, and attentive reader: “for if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare *himself* to the battle?”

But, 3. Whoever makes the virtue of the sacrifice and death of Christ to depend, *merely*, upon his being in union with a divine person, doth, in my humble opinion, not only disbelieve the *scripture* doctrine of the atonement, but, by a necessary consequence, denies also the merit of the blood of Christ, and makes him to have died in vain. Christ indeed was in *union* with God, but the scripture never imputes the *virtue* of his sufferings to that union, but to his *actual obedience* and *death*, according to the will of God, and as he had received a commandment from his Father. See John vi. 38. xiv. 31. Rom. v. 9, 10, 19. Gal. i. 3. iii. 13. Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14, 20. Heb. ii. 14, 15. ix. 14, 15. xiii. 12. 1 Pet. ii. 24. 1 John i. 7. Isa. liii. throughout.

C. L. “The personal acts of Christ likewise prove his divinity, on “these he rested the evidence of his deity in the days of his flesh, “John x. 37, 38. the miracles which he wrought, and the power he “gave to his disciples to work miracles in his *NAME*, were proofs of “his claim to Deity in his own right,” p. 10.

Ans. These ministers have before declared, that Christ, as *God-man*, in his *office capacity*, did nothing of *himself*, but I there told you (see page 5, 6) that they would soon deny it all again, as you see they have done in the passage before us. But laying aside their inconsistencies, let us proceed to a further examination of their doctrine.—And did Christ indeed work miracles in his own name? and did he refer to them as proofs of his *claim* to DEITY in his *own right*? These Gentlemen are pleased to tell us he did. But what doth the scripture say of this matter? For it is agreed on all hands, that we ought to believe and obey God, rather than men. “I, saith the Son of God, *do nothing of myself*,” John viii. 28. “I am come in my Father’s name,” v. 43. “I came forth “from God, neither came I *of myself* but he sent me,” viii. 42. Therefore “*my doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me*. If any man will do “*his will*, he shall know of the doctrine, *whether it be of God*, or “*whether I speak of myself*; he that speaketh of himself seeketh his own “glory,” vii. 16, 17, 18. “I seek not my own glory, there is one that “*seeketh and judgeth*,” viii. 50. If I honor myself, my honor is no- “thing, it is my FATHER that honoreth me, *of whom ye say that he is* “*your God*,” ver. 54. and to his disciples he saith, “The words that “I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, but the FATHER *who dwell-* “*eth in me, he doth the works*,” xiv. 10. Therefore “*the works that I do* “*in my FATHER’s name, they bear witness of me*,” x. 25. What *witness* do they bear? Do they testify that Christ was the *true* GOD, the FATHER’s *equal*? He says no such thing, but quite otherwise; “for these works,” saith Christ, “bear witness that the Father hath *sent me*,” v. 36. and again, “*Though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know* “and believe,” what? that I am God? No. But, “that ye may know “and believe that the FATHER is *in me*, and I *in him*,” x. 38.—Now *vital energy*, and influence, are communicated from the *head* to the *body*, and from one person to another, by *union*; wherefore to his disciples, he saith, “abide *in me*, and I *in you*; for without me ye can do no- “thing;

" thing; but *he* that abideth *in* me, and I *in* him, the same bringeth forth much fruit:" in like manner, Christ being, by union, *in* the Father, and the Father *in* him, did all his mighty works by influence and energy received immediately from the FATHER; but *of himself* could do nothing, as he again and again, in the most solemn language, expressly testifies. And that a believer's *living* by Christ, is a proper resemblance of Christ's *living* by the Father, himself hath plainly told us, "for as the *living* Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, *so* he that eateth me, even he shall live by me," John vi. 57. "For the *head* of every man is CHRIST, and the *head* of Christ is GOD," 1 Cor. xi. 3. Now in all these texts 'tis clear and certain that Christ speaks of himself, as a *proper person*; and if these personal notes and characters, which he here assumes, are not to be referred to that *Being* and *nature* which constitutes his true and distinct personality; it cannot, I think, be certainly known, when a *person* speaks, or is spoken of; by any terms, words, or marks whatever—If there be men who deny this, to what can it be imputed? to ignorance? or perverseness? or prejudice? For my part, I frankly own, I cannot impute it to any thing else. But if Christ, in the above text, speak of himself *properly* as a person, and as the Son of God, which he most certainly does, then doth Christ himself expressly declare, and that in the most solemn manner, that *he* is not the TRUE GOD.

2. If Christ had wrought his miracles *of himself*, and in his *own name*, they could have been no *witness* that the Father had sent him; for that which a person speaks or does *in his own name*, cannot possibly be a proof that he is sent, and acts by the authority of another. But the miracles which Christ wrought *bore witness* of him, that the Father had sent him; therefore they prove, and only prove, that his Father alone is the true GOD. As then you allow, that Christ rested the evidence of his proper DEITY on the miracles which he wrought; it is most manifest and certain that he had no *personal* DEITY, except the FATHER only, who dwelt in him†: for he not only declares that he did the works in his FATHER's name; i. e. by power, commandment, and authority, received from the Father; but *he denies expressly* that he did them *of himself*; and on the other hand, *he asserts positively* that the FATHER *himself* did the works. Can any words be more plain? Can any proof be more clear and full? And thus it was that Christ declared, and manifested his Father's name, see John xv. 24. xvii. 25, 26. and *this* is that GOD, *even the FATHER*, who was manifested in the flesh, 1 Tim. iii. 16, for when the Son of God was made flesh, the FATHER himself was *with* him, and manifested in him, and by him, as the scripture witnesseth.

But, 3.—We readily grant, that the apostles wrought miracles in CHRIST's name; but it was by the power of the Spirit which Christ received from the Father for them; and gave unto the apostles for that purpose: this evidently appears from his own words; "he that believeth on me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, *because I go unto my Father*," John xiv. Doth he not plainly rest the whole matter upon his going to the FATHER, that he might obtain the Spirit for them? Most certainly he does. And hence he saith again, "behold I send the *promise* of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." "Having therefore received of the FATHER the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this," &c.

† See Divine Revelation, p. 302—305.



Acts ii. 33. see also Rom. xv. 18, 19. Heb. ii. 3, 4. nor did the apostles at any time work a miracle in the name of Christ, *as their God*, but only in the name of him, *whom God had raised from the dead, and whom he had made both Lord and Christ*. Upon the same ground likewise, and in the very same manner, doth Christ forgive sins, that is, by power and authority received from the Father, and therefore the FATHER himself forgives us our sins by Christ, and for his sake; as it is written, "God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."—"For him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance and remission of sins," Acts iii. 26. v. 31. And again; "God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you," Eph. iv. 32.

C. L. "I, even I, am the LORD, and besides me there is no Savior, Isa. xliii. 11. Christ is expressly called *God our Savior*, Tit. i. 3. The saints look for him as the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ, Tit. ii. 13. "the name Jesus was given him," &c. p. 10.

Ans. The distinction between JEHOVAH the LIVING God, and his Son Jesus Christ, is, in the scripture, pointed out, and declared to us, with all possible clearness—from whence we learn and are assured, that the true God hath given his Son, and raised him up, and exalted him to be our Savior, John iii. 16, 17. Acts v. 31. xiii. 23, 30, 33, 34, 47. but he whom JEHOVAH hath raised up to be a Savior, cannot himself be JEHOVAH the Savior; but must of necessity be *another Being*, and *another Savior*, distinct from him\*. Jehovah and his Christ therefore, though united in one, do certainly save us in different respects, as the scripture teacheth, for he whom JEHOVAH hath raised up and exalted to be our Savior, saves us by *dying*, and *interceding* for us; but JEHOVAH himself doth not, nor can save us, either by *dying*, or *interceding* for us. Will these Gentlemen in plain and direct terms presume to assert, that JEHOVAH *did dye*, or that his Christ *did not dye* for men? If not, why do they continue to make use of ambiguous and equivocal terms, and thereby darken the counsel of God by words without knowledge?

2. That Tit. i. 3. is spoken of Christ, is barely asserted without proof.—We on the contrary, with much more reason and truth, may venture to deny it—Christ is not in that text, nor any where else, called "God our Savior," but 'tis God the FATHER who is so called, as is plain both from the context, and also from 1 Tim. i. and ii. 3, 4, 5. Here I would just ask these Gentlemen, *if the Father be not God our Savior?* and if he is never so called? and if he be so, what reason can be assigned why these texts may not be rather understood of the Father, than of the Son?—Again, Christ is not called the GREAT GOD in Tit. ii. 13. but 'tis God the FATHER who is there spoken of, and is so called; and that with the greatest propriety, because HE is the GREAT GOD, and there is none other but HE. The original also may more literally be rendered, "looking for the *appearing* of the glory of the GREAT GOD; and of our Savior Jesus Christ;" and whose glory this is we are told in other scriptures, which refer to the very same subject, that is, to the *second coming* of Christ, who will then come in his *own glory*, and also in the *glory of his Father*, as himself hath told us, Matt. xvi. 27. Luke ix. 26. Nor is it reasonable to suppose, that the apostle, when speaking of the glory which will attend Christ's second coming, would have omitted to mention the Father's glory, seeing Christ himself hath so expressly declared it—But to refer the whole of the passage to the person of Christ, is, in effect, to deny that he will come in his Father's glory—therefore by the *glory* of the GREAT GOD is

\* See Scripture Testimony of Christ, in a letter to Mr. Romaine, p. 40—43.

undoubtedly

undoubtedly meant the glory of the Father. Paul declares likewise in the next chapter, that the *Christian* hath *two Saviors*, and who can *these* be? Certainly one of them is God the Father, and the other his Son Jesus Christ—God *our Savior*, saith the apostle, *saves us*, according to his mercy, *through Jesus Christ our Savior*, Tit. iii. 4, 5, 6. To this great truth the apostle John also adds his testimony, “In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him—and we have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world,” 1 John iv. 9, 14.

C. L. “We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ—though the Father judgeth no man, yet God is judge himself,” p. 11.

Ans. Do not these Gentlemen know there is a sense in which the Father doth judge all men? why then have they concealed it? and do they not also know that the saints shall judge the world? and are the saints therefore God? Certainly not. So that in different respects God will judge the world, and CHRIST will judge the world, and the *saints* will judge the world.—The bare mention of these particulars is sufficient to discover the weakness, and artifice of the above argument.

C. L. “We shall only mention one text more, as demonstrative of Christ’s personal divinity which is *creation*. This is expressly ascribed to our Lord, as well as to the Father: “for by him were all things created,” &c. Col. i. 16, &c. “All things were made by him,” &c. John i. 3, 10. The Father, speaking to him, saith, “thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth,” &c. Heb. i. 10, p. 11, 12.

Ans. “When HE (JEHOVAH) prepared the heavens, I (saith Christ) was there—when HE appointed the foundations of the earth, then I was by him,” Prov. viii. As then God the Father, of *whom* are all things, created the heavens, and the earth, the same works cannot be ascribed to any other person in the same sense: \* but only as a medium or *instrument* by and *through* whom he created them; now we know that God created all things by Jesus Christ, therefore to him, in opposition to the angels, he saith, “thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth,” &c. for there was then no other person with God, nor did he create any thing without his Son, but all things *by* him; therefore this scripture is properly cited by the apostle as an evidence and proof of Christ’s *prior existence* and *superior excellency* to that of the angels. But further, Christ, in the works of creation, is as plainly distinguished from God *absolutely*, as from the FATHER *personally*, Heb. i. 2. Eph. iii. 9. and he who denies the one, denies the other also. As then we have the same scripture warrant to distinguish Christ from God, as from the Father; we have the same divine authority to say, that the Son is *not that* God who created the worlds *by* him, as to say that he is *not the* FATHER: and they who affirm he is that God, do, by a natural consequence, declare, that the Son, is the Father also.

2. When the apostle saith *without him* (the Word) was not any thing made that was made, it is unreasonable to suppose that the apostle speaks of the Word, as the most high God, *with* whom that Word was: for *wherever* doubted or denied whether the MOST HIGH GOD made all things? But that he made all things *by* another, even by his first begotten Son, and made nothing without him, was not so clearly and fully revealed under the *Old Testament* as it is under the *New*. The apostle also assigns proper reasons why God made all things *by* Jesus Christ. First, because Christ is the *FIRST BE-*

\* See Scripture Testimony of Christ, p. 35—39.

COTTON of, or *before* all creation, not because he was GOD's *coequal*. Secondly, because it *pleased* the INVISIBLE GOD, even the FATHER, that all fulness should dwell in his Son; not because the Son himself was the *almighty*: these reasons, therefore, are a certain proof that the Father alone, according to the apostle's doctrine, is the only LIVING, and TRUE GOD.—And the whole first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, is plainly written to prove, that Christ is superior to, and exalted above, all the angels; and not to prove that the GREAT GOD was superior to angels, for what Jew, or Gentile ever denied that?

C. L. "The apostle charges those with ignorance of God, who did *service* to them who by *nature* are no Gods, Gal. iv. 8." p. 12.

Ans. The term *nature* is very ambiguous, and is used in various senses, see Rom. ii. 14. 27. 1 Cor. xi. 14. Gal. ii. 15. Eph. ii. 3. But in whatever sense it be understood in the text before us, the meaning of the objection raised from it seems to be this, that no *service* is due, nor ought to be paid, to any *Being* except to the LIVING GOD only; now *that* God of whom the apostle here speaks is undoubtedly the FATHER of Christ, as is manifest from the three preceding verses; and whereas the Son is not the Father, therefore the Son cannot be that God by nature of whom the text speaks, nor is he to be served as such, for the apostle evidently speaks of the FATHER only.

2. The Gentiles, we know, worshipped *dumb idols*, that could neither hear nor help them; and they served and sacrificed to devils, which the true God had not appointed nor commanded, but forbidden; nor had they a right to their service in any sense whatever. But there are other Beings, who were constituted God's by divine appointment, for JEHOVAH saith to Moses, "I have made thee a God to Pharaoh," and of other rulers, "I said ye are Gods," and the scripture cannot be broken. Yet neither of these were the *idols* of the Gentiles, nor *devils*, nor the *true God*: and it is observable that our Lord claimed a right to that name in no other sense whatever, than that which was given to the rulers of God's people, John x. 33—35.

3. There is a *service* which is due to other beings besides God which is neither dishonorable to him, nor idolatrous; and that *because* it is *subordinate*, and because God hath *commanded* it. The elder, saith the scripture, shall *serve* the younger, Rom. ix. 12. and in Gal. v. 13. the saints are commanded to *serve* one another. Are the saints therefore God by nature? certainly not. How much more then is Christ, the KING of saints, and HEAD of the church, to be served and honored *as such*? for God hath commanded every knee to bow to him: and that this homage is not *supreme* but *subordinate* is manifest, because God hath commanded it, and because it terminates in the glory of God the Father.

C. L. "In the beginning was the word, &c. he was *with* God, as a distinct person, and he was God, being of the same nature and essence with the Father," p. 13.

Ans. This again is barely asserted, and that without reason, as well as without proof; for the term God never means *nature* or *essence* in all the Bible: therefore your gloss hath nothing to support it. God is a name which the MOST HIGH hath put upon many Beings both angels and men, as hath been already proved, and that because he hath invested them with power and authority to represent his person, and to act in his name. As then there is but one TRUE GOD, that person who was *with* him, cannot himself be THAT GOD; but the WORD was with God, therefore the Word is not that God with whom he was: but, with propriety he bears his name for reasons which have been already mentioned.—See page 11, 12.



2. It is commonly supposed, and often urged by the advocates of the Arian system, that God's own and only begotten Son, must needs be of the *very same, or like nature* with God the Father, who begat him. This indeed is frequently said but hath never yet been proved, and I am persuaded never will; for how should we know that which God hath not told us in his word, except by immediate revelation he discover it to us. But Could it be proved that the *substance* of Christ, as the Son of God, was of the *very same, or like nature and essence* with the Father: yet this would not prove him to be JEHOVAH the TRUE GOD. For we cannot know nor demonstrate any Being, to be the true God from his bare nature or essence, but he is known to us only from his *self-existence, absolute sovereignty, omniscience, omnipotence*, and other infinite perfections, as they are manifested in his divine works of *Creation, Providence, and Redemption*: and by these alone is the TRUE GOD revealed, and made known to us in the sacred scriptures, and not by his abstract nature and essence, for no name of the DIVINE BEING, as JEHOVAH, ALBIM, GOD, &c. whereby he hath been pleased to reveal himself in the scripture, is descriptive of his *more nature or essence*. We are told indeed, "GOD IS A SPIRIT;" and so is an angel, and so is the intelligent part of man. But the scripture hath no where declared, nor can reason prove, that the Father of spirits, is of a nature essentially different from those spirits, whose FATHER he is. But self-existence, independence, and immutability, are attributes peculiar to the FATHER of spirits: none but himself alone, is possessor of infinite perfections. To conceive, therefore, and speak of spirits, as of various orders, ranks, and degrees; and as differing from each other, both in respect of purity and goodness, of wisdom power and glory; is rational and scriptural: but we have no warrant from scripture to speak of them, as of different natures, nor have we the least idea of any such difference; but for ought we know to the contrary, all intelligent spirits are of one, and the same or like nature: although some of them, with respect to intrinsic worth, purity, and glory, may differ as much as the precious brilliant from the most contemptible pebble: but tho' these stones so widely differ in point of worth, excellence, and glory, yet they are both insensible matter, and of the like essence, or nature. But this is manifest and certain, both from reason and revelation, that there is, and can be, but one INFINITE SPIRIT, who is *self-existent, independent, and absolutely eternal*, and THIS SPIRIT is the only living and TRUE GOD, the FATHER of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all. And of all derived spirits, he that is *nearest JEHOVAH, and resembles him most* in his uncreated, underived, and boundless perfections; HE, I say, is the most honorable, glorious, and happy of all derived BEINGS: and we read of one, his own and only begotten Son, who is the *brightness* of his glory, and the *express image* of his person. And how great and glorious a spirit, infinite love, wisdom, and power *voidly disposed and able to produce*, inconceivably transcends the utmost stretch of human, or angelic minds to reach, or imagine: yet this spirit cannot himself be JEHOVAH, *absolutely supreme, unoriginate and independent*, because he is *begotten* by him. Now to deny that there is such a Being as this, *distinct* from JEHOVAH, and begotten by him, is, in my opinion, to deny not only the plain doctrines of scripture, but also to deny that the living God is infinite in love and goodness, in wisdom and power. Should it therefore be allowed that the Son of God is of the *same or like nature* with the Father, it would prove nothing against us, nor could our doctrine be affected by it: for no arguments, whatever, built on that hypothesis, can possibly prove that the Son himself is JEHOVAH the LIVING GOD †. Because PERSONAL SELF-EXISTENCE is essential to DEITY, but incompatible with GENERATION and SONSHIP.

† See Preface to Scripture Testimony of Christ.



C. L. "That the blessed Jesus has a soul, we believe;—but that his soul existed before his body wants proof. That Christ had a pre-existent nature, is evident; for he saith, *before Abraham was, I AM*: but that was not his soul, but his divine person; for *in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*. This person who was with God, and who was God, took upon him afterwards a nature which he had not in the beginning, therefore it was not the human soul, for that did not take upon it any other different nature;" p. 13, 14.

Ans. The scriptures to which we are here referred say not a word about the nature of Christ, either in direct terms or by implication. He might, as to his *pre-existent nature*, be either *human*, or *angelic*, or *divine*, for any thing that these texts say to the contrary †; your inference therefore cannot be certainly true, because it is built upon precarious, or false premises: and unless you adopt the prevailing Sadducean doctrine of *materialism*, and seekon the whole of man to be *mere matter or mortal*; you cannot but allow the human body to be of a different nature from the human spirit.—But it seems to us clear and certain both from reason and revelation, that the soul of Christ existed before his body, which I shall attempt to evince from the following considerations.—And first, It hath, I think, been already proved, and will, I hope, by-and-by more fully appear, that the human body or flesh, strictly speaking, never means the whole man (though sometimes, by a *figure*, it be put for it), and that because it is often distinguished from, and set in opposition to, *another part* of man even his rational *spirit*; but this it could not be if the flesh *properly* meant the *whole* of man. Therefore when the scripture saith, "the Word was made flesh,"—"The Son of God was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," and "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;" it is, I conceive, most proper to understand by the term *flesh* in these texts, the mere animal nature or human body of Christ; wherefore "when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me," *καταρτίωσιν*, adapted or fitted to me: now for *whom* or for *what* should a *human body* be thus prepared? Certainly for a *human spirit*. But if, as you suppose, the Word or Son of God did actually assume *complete manhood*, or the *whole* of human nature; it is very unaccountable that the scripture should always speak of it in *figurative*, or improper language, and never in plain and direct terms; for it no where says, the Son of God was *made man*, or assumed a human nature; but it always saith, that *he* was *made flesh*, or in the *likeness* of men, or of *sinful flesh*, or that a *body* was prepared for him; therefore, I infer, it is most rational to believe, that his spirit *pre-existed*.—And that this opinion is not a mere *human sentiment* nor an *absurd sentiment*; but the plain and certain doctrine of scripture, is, I think, further clear and evident from the following words; "Forasmuch then as the children were *partakers of flesh and blood*; Christ himself likewise took *part of the same*:" not a part of their *spirit* but a part of their *flesh*. Neither can the children be said with propriety to partake of soul and body both; for these constitute the whole of their nature and being; by *flesh and blood* then is evidently meant the *animal nature* in distinction from the *rational soul*; therefore Christ's partaking with them undoubtedly means that he took not a human soul, but a body only; consequently his spirit pre-existed.

2. "The Son of God was made of the seed of David according to the flesh," Rom. i. 3. but if the body only be derived from the earthly parent, which opinion seems generally to be received, and is, I think, coun-

† See Scripture Sufficiency, p. 33, 34.

tenanced by Heb. xii. 9. where God is declared to be the Father of *spirits*, in contradistinction to the fathers of our *flesh*. See also Eccles. xii. 7. Acts xvii. 29. doth it not plainly follow, that when the *Word* and *Son* of God is said he *made flesh*, it must be meant of the body only, especially as the word is said to dwell or tabernacle among us; that is, in a tabernacle of human flesh, see 2 Cor. v. 1. Also in Rom. i. 3, 4. the opposition between *flesh* and *spirit*, is plain and obvious; and at the same time both the *pre-existence* and *personality* of the spirit of Christ, is evidently implied.

3. When the Son of God was hanging on the cross, in the very article of death, he said, "FATHER into thy hands I commend my spirit;" whereby he plainly declared that God was the Father of his spirit, and that according to the spirit, he was the Son of God; and at the same time he manifested also the proper and essential distinction between the spirit, and the body of his flesh; and that the former retained its consciousness of Being, and was capable of existing with God, when separated from, and without the body: Stephen also died in the same faith, when he committed his spirit immediately to Christ, "for the head of every man is CHRIST, and the head of Christ is God." Now that spirit which Christ commended into the hands of his Father, could be no other than a human spirit, for God cannot commend himself to God. Neither is it reasonable to suppose that the human spirit of Christ was commended to any other divine person, save that alone, to whom he was united, and by whom he was supported; consequently the human spirit of Christ was in union with, and sustained by, no other divine person, but the Father: therefore the common notion of a *hypostatical*, or *personal union* of the man Christ, with any other person, except the Father only, appears to be contrary both to scripture, reason, and truth.

4. The *Messiah*, and *Word* of God, before his incarnation, is often, by the prophets, called an Angel, see Exod. xxiii. 20. Isa. lxiii. 9. Mal. iii. 1. (and by the way an angel is a spirit) but this same *Word* made flesh, is always represented in the New Testament as a true and real man; the apostles never called him *God-man*, but they constantly called him a man, or the Son of God, or Christ Jesus the Lord; and as such he himself always spake, and acted, and died, and rose again: and this is that "Lord of glory who was crucified;" not JEHOVAH, but "the second man, even the Lord from heaven,"—"whom God hath made both Lord and Christ."

5. The person who was sent and came from heaven to redeem the world, underwent a real change, and actually suffered in the flesh, for us; but it was the man Christ only that suffered (for the true God cannot suffer), therefore his human spirit pre-existed: they who deny this, must deny also, that the person who came from heaven suffered any thing; for if another nature only suffered, the person inhabiting that nature, however united to it, cannot be said, in any proper sense, to have suffered at all; but the Christ, and Son of God truly and properly suffered, and died for us, as the scripture witnesseth. See Rom. v. 6, 8, 10.

6. The person who came from heaven is the mediator between God and men, but this, we are assured, is the man Christ Jesus, therefore his spirit pre-existed. See John xi. 50. Rom. v. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 5.

7. Christ himself hath plainly declared, that, as man, he came down from heaven, for "no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who was <sup>†</sup> in heaven,"

<sup>†</sup> *was*, est vel erat, is or was BE-*CAUSE*. This participle ought to have been rendered in the past tense, in John iii. 13. as it is in ix. 35. xii. 17.

John iii. 13. And that the Jews also thus understood him is certain, from vi. 42. nor did they mistake his meaning, for Christ afterwards adds, "what, and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he *was before?*" ver. 62. therefore 'tis plain that Christ, as man, was in heaven before his incarnation, and as such came down from thence: the opposition also which he makes of himself, not to God, but to other men, is a farther proof of it; for what propriety is there in saying, the Son of *man* was in heaven, because God was there. Christ's being in union with a divine person will not justify the expression; nor can it, I think, be defended by the strongest *figure* of Rhetoric, unless it should be supposed that Christ spake one thing and meant another, which no christian will say, or imagine. I conclude, therefore, that Christ meant as he spake, and that his doctrine is divinely clear and true, consequently, *as man*, he pre-existed.—And this being admitted, it doth, I conceive, clearly follow, that the common notion of the Trinity has no foundation in the New Testament.—*Corollary.*—

"Forasmuch as in several of the preceding scriptures (as John i. 14. iii. 13. vi. 62. Phil. ii. 6, 7.) there is such a *change* and *humiliation* asserted concerning Christ, as could not properly be asserted concerning an eternal and immutable Being, as such, there is reason to believe that Christ had, before his incarnation, a *created* or *derived* nature which would admit of such a change \*."

"This doctrine greatly magnifies the self-denial and the condescending love of our Lord Jesus Christ, in his state of humiliation and death."—"Conceive of this glorious human spirit, the only begotten Son of God, who was vested with such dignity before the creation of the world, united personally to the divine nature, and thus adored by angels, appearing often to the patriarchs in the form of God, with rays of divine majesty, and governing the nations of Israel, or church of God, during all the former ages—Behold this holy happy Spirit descending from heaven, to take upon him, not flesh only, but the *likeness* of *sinful flesh*; and according to the antient covenant between him and his FATHER, now uniting himself to animal nature. How divinely glorious was the love of God in parting with such a Son from his bosom! How amazing was the condescension and self-denial of this glorious Savior, in giving himself for us! When we conceive of this pre-existent soul of Christ, this glorious, this holy and happy spirit, with pleasure consenting to his Father's proposal of his most surprizing abasement and bloody agonies, it gives us an example of such profound humility, such absolute obedience to God his Father, and such unspeakable love to sinful men, as far surpasses the greatest instances that he ever gave, or ever was capable of giving, while he was here upon earth; if we suppose (according to the common opinion) that he was merely born, and trained up for this service, without his own previous consent. This idea of the *love* of *Christ* answers those sublime characters which the apostle gives of it, Eph. iii. 18, 19. it is a *love* that has *lengths* and *breadths* in it, that has *heights* and *depths*; it is a *love*, that *passeth knowledge* †."

\* Doddridges Lectures, p. 383.

† Dr. Watts on the early existence of Christ's human soul. See Divine Revelation p. 24—101.

C. L. "The



C. L. "The soul of Christ was not a person—it being called a man—does not prove its personality; the body of Adam was so called, Gen. ii. 7. it is urged that Christ is called the *second man*, the *Lord from heaven*; but this no more proves that the soul of Christ pre-existed in heaven, than its being said, *the first man was of the earth earthy*; proves that Adam's soul pre-existed in the ground," p. 14.

Answ. Though the *body* of a man be not a person, it doth not therefore follow that the *rational soul* is not a person, for the soul of man is an *intelligent agent*, and capable of performing every act that is proper to a person, which the body is not.—"The soul is a *Being* by itself—it can and doth exist and subsist by itself alone, when separated from the body, Luke xxiii. 43. Matt. x. 28. Both *scripture* and *philosophy* concur in this, that the soul is the chief, most noble, and principal part of man, from which the whole man is, and ought to be designated, see Gen. xlvii. 26. *all the souls*, &c. i. e. all the persons;—the apostle in 2 Cor. v. 8. seems to exclude the body from the notion of *personality*, when he saith, *we are willing to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord*: *we*, a term of *personality*, is there given to the *soul* exclusive of the *body*."—"To this we may add 2 Cor. iv. 16. where the soul is called the *man*, and the *inner man* too, the body being but the external face and shadow of the man—that which is seen is not the man, but that is the man which is invisible."

2. *That the first man was of the earth earthy*, is indeed no proof that his soul pre-existed in the ground, but if it prove that his *body* pre-existed there, as it certainly does; then, for the same reason, also, when Christ is called the *second man*, the *Lord from heaven*, this equally proves, not that his *body*, but that his *spirit*, pre-existed in heaven. And, whereas it is allowed that the *earthly body* is sometimes called *man*; surely with much more reason, the *intelligent spirit* may, be so called. For if the human body be indeed inhabited by a *rational and immortal spirit*, and if *that spirit be more noble and excellent than the earthly tabernacle*; then nothing can be more plain than this, that the *rational spirit* may with more truth and propriety be called *man*, than the *mere animal body*.

C. L. "As a creature cannot be the cause, neither does it seem probable it could be an instrument in creation: a creating instrument must either be employed before the creature to be produced be created, or after; not before, because there was not any thing existing for an instrument to work upon; not after, because when the creature is produced, it is too late for an instrument to be employed in creating it," p. 15.

Answ. Here our authors do not deny, but even a creature might be an *instrument* in creation, they only say, it does not *seem probable*, yet, as if they would not be thought to allow its *probability*, they immediately frame an argument in order to prove that 'tis impossible; but their argument, in my opinion, is so manifestly futile and sophistical; that I wonder, as men of discernment and integrity, they could suffer themselves to frame and publish it; for it amounts, I think, to nothing more than this, an *instrument* cannot be employed, as an *instrument*, because it is not the *hand* that uses it, nor the *power* that works by it; this is the sum of their mighty argument.—But 'tis plain there is no need that the thing to be produced should, in any sense, *pre-exist*, in order to its being produced by an instrument, when *that instrument* is supposed to



be in the hand of the DIVINE BEING, and not to will, nor to do any thing of itself, but to act only as under the immediate direction and influence of infinite wisdom and power. Now JEHOVAH the LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT, who took possession of Christ the beginning of his way, can give both being and form to whatever he please; and can work and create, as well by an instrument, as without it. Surely nothing can be more irrational and absurd, than to suppose that the ALMIGHTY could have produced all things without an instrument; but was not able to create the same things by an instrument: the supposition is equally contrary both to reason and revelation.

C. L. "If Jesus Christ be not God the Lord, the holy psalmist and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, were guilty of an horrid sin, in directing the afflicted to apply for relief to a mere creature; and Stephen the famous martyr, died in the very act of idolatry.—Christ and his apostles were corrupters of religion rather than reformers, if Jesus was not a divine person;—for they established an idolatry of the most dangerous kind," p. 17, 18.

Ans. There is such a resemblance between the 22d and 69th psalms, and several parts of the 102d, that I am inclined to think the latter, as well as the two former, is a prophetic description of the sufferings of Christ, and of his prayer to the Father, both for himself and the church; and it seems to me, also, that the 25th and following verses contain the Father's answer for his Son's encouragement and support under his great and unparalleled sufferings, "when in the days of his flesh he offered up supplications and prayers, with strong cryings and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death;" and yourselves have already allowed (see p. 15); that the 25th and following verses, are not the words of a man, but of God the Father speaking to his Son, though here again, as in other places, you contradict and oppose your own selves; but if the words cited by the apostle be the words of the Father, as I think they are, then 'tis clear the former part of the psalm contains a description of the sufferings and prayers of Christ.

2. Did not the angel direct Cornelius to apply to a mere creature for relief? when he bid him send for Peter, "who should tell him words whereby he and his house should be saved," Acts xi. 14. and the apostle James also, when he directed the sick and the afflicted to "send for the elders of the church?" yet I will not therefore say, that "they were guilty of a horrid sin," for I believe they had a divine warrant for it, and therefore it could be no sin; but it would have been sin in them not to have done as God had commanded them.

Stephen, we know, committed his departing spirit into the hands of the Lord Jesus, even to that Son of man whom he saw standing at the right hand of God; but did he therefore die in the act of idolatry, or is Christ indeed an idol, because he is the Son and image of God, and not God himself? I speak as a man, God forbid! the true image of God is not an idol, nor is it idolatry to pray unto him whom God hath made both Lord and Christ.—But you have ventured to go a step further, and have even dared to say, "if Jesus be not a divine person," (by which you mean the TRUE GOD) both Christ, and his apostles were corrupters of religion and patrons of idolatry: yet Christ himself hath plainly declared, that he is not the true God, for he testifies that his Father is the only true God, see John viii. 54. xvii. 3. xx. 17. therefore as you cannot prove him a liar; so neither will you be able to exculpate yourselves from the charge of blasphemy—and 'tis well for some men that blasphemy

blasphemy against the Son is not unpardonable.—Paul obtained mercy because he did it *ignorantly in unbelief*.

C. L. “Christ is likewise the saints trust, we (viz. the apostles) trusted in Christ, &c. Eph. i. 12. and in his name shall the Gentiles trust, Matt. xii. 21.—Curst be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, Jer. xvii. 5. and David, speaking of Christ, says, blessed are all they that put their trust in him, Psalm ii. 12.” p. 18.

Ans. JEHOVAH is the hope and confidence of his people, and so is Christ, but in very different respects. For the saints take refuge and hope in Christ, as having borne their sins, and died for them, according to the will of God; who also hath raised him from the dead: but they do not thus hope or trust in the LIVING GOD: for God hath not suffered and died for them, neither could he; but we believe and trust in God, as having sent, upheld, and given his Son to die for us; and as promising and giving to us eternal life in his son. Therefore the saints by thus hoping in God, and in his Christ, are not deluded as you have unwarrantably said, and weakly imagined.—The text in *Jeremiah* you have intirely mistaken, or perverted, for it relates to the Jews trusting to an arm of sinful flesh, as Egypt, &c. (see Isa. xxx. 1, 2. xxxi. 1, 2, 3. Jer. ii. 36.) for temporal deliverance from their enemies, and that not only without a divine warrant for it, but in opposition to an express command to the contrary; and therefore also their hearts are said to depart from JEHOVAH: but he that hopeth and trusteth in Jesus, as the Son and Christ of God, hath God’s word and commandment for it; nor doth he thereby depend on an arm of flesh, nor depart from Jehovah, but on the contrary he obeys his voice, and returns to JEHOVAH, by the way of Christ, and so makes JEHOVAH, in Christ, his only hope and trust; nor can any one truly hope in the LIVING GOD that doth not thus hope in his Christ: wherefore he saith, “ye believe in GOD, believe also in me,” for “I am the way, the truth, and the life, no man cometh unto the FATHER but by me,” John xiv. 1, 6. therefore “by him we believe in GOD, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, that our faith and hope might be in God,” 1 Pet. i. 20.

C. L. “That the Holy Ghost is a person, appears evidently from the following considerations, he is the subject of power, of knowledge, of will, &c.—we frequently read of the power of the Holy Ghost, Rom. xv. 13. 19. 1 Thess. i. 5. if the Holy Ghost be not a powerful person, but a power or property of the divine being, then the reading in the two first passages, should have been *the power of the power*, and in the last, *the word came in power and in the power*, but the impropriety of such reading is evident—he is possessed of a mind; *the mind of the Spirit*, Rom. viii. 27.” p. 20.

Ans. These divines have asserted above (see page 4. 5.) that the man Christ is no person, and yet as man he is said to will, to pray, to believe, to trust, &c. all which are personal acts; and surely, if these do not prove the man Christ to be a person, what is here said (according to their own reasoning) will not prove the divine Spirit to be a person. The scripture foreseeth, and maketh wise, Gal. iii. 8. 2 Tim. iii. 15. GRACE teacheth and reigneth, Tit. ii. 12. Rom. v. 21. FAITH worketh miracles, justifieth, and saveth, Acts iii. 16. Rom. iii. 28. Luke vii. 50. the WATER and the BLOOD bare witness and cleanse from sin, 1 John i. 7. v. 8. CHARITY rejoiceth, believeth, begeth, &c. 1 Cor. xiii. 6, 7. But are these therefore, or any of them persons? Certainly are not.

2. The power of a power sounds indeed harsh; but the agency, or power of a powerful spirit, is not at all improper.—“God is a spirit,” but

but to say the spirit of a spirit, would seem harsh and improper, tho' there be no impropriety, in saying, the *spirit* of God, who is a SPIRIT, or SPIRITUAL BEING \*; the absurdity therefore arises from the impropriety of your own phrases.—“It is the observation of some learned men, that where the word *power* is added to the *Spirit*, or *Holy Ghost*, it signifies a more than ordinary measure and influence of the Spirit, as in Luke i. 35. Acts x. 38. 1 Cor. ii. 4 1 Thess. i. 5 †.”

3. We read of the *φρονημα σαρκος* *mind of the flesh*, as well as *φρονημα πνευματος* *mind of the Spirit*, and yet the flesh, simply considered, is no person—the apostle (in Rom. xv. 19. marginal reading) speaks of the *power of signs and wonders*, *δυναμις σημειων και τερατων*, as well as *δυναμις πνευματος*, the *power of the Spirit*; but signs and wonders are no persons:—This text therefore contains an argument rather *against* your doctrine, than *for* it.

4. The Holy Spirit is the subject of power, of knowledge, of will, &c. and so is the spirit of man; yet the *spirit* of man is not *another person* besides the man; we cannot therefore infer from thence, that the Spirit of God is another person besides God, and distinct from him, as the Arians affirm; which also *your* argument tends to prove, if it prove any thing: “for *what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God* :” now, in my opinion, these words of the apostle do as fully prove, that God and his Spirit are but one person, as that man and his spirit are but one person; and *we have the same reason for distinguishing the spirit of man, from man; as for distinguishing the Spirit of God, from God*.

C. L. “That he (the Spirit) is a person *distinct* from the Father and the Son, is clear from his being called *ANOTHER* comforter *sent* by the Father and the Son. John xvi. 7.” p. 21.

Ans. That the Spirit is another comforter *distinct* from Christ, is plain, because he received that Spirit from the Father; but we have not the same reason for saying, that the Spirit is another comforter personally *distinct* from the Father; for from whom did the Father receive his Spirit? Besides the FATHER *himself* is declared to be “the God of all comfort :” if then there be another person that comfort us, who is not the Father, he cannot be the TRUE GOD, for the FATHER is declared to be the God of all comfort,” 2 Cor. i. 3, 4. To say that the Spirit is the same Being, but not the same person, is, in my opinion, contrary both to reason and scripture. The distinction between an *intelligent Being*, and an *intelligent person*, has no foundation in nature: and I am persuaded, that they who profess to believe and hold it, cannot tell us what they mean, nor have they, in their own minds, the least idea of any distinction between them; and I am very certain the scripture knows of none.—The personal pronoun *ειμι*, *he*, is by our Lord applied to the word which he spake: and why? not that the word spoken was a person, but because it was the word of a person, of whom? of the Spirit? no; but of the FATHER who spake by him, see John xii. 48, 49. yet we do not deny the propriety of speaking of the Spirit under personal characters, for the scripture often doth it, and therefore we do it also; but we deny that the Spirit is *another proper person distinct* from God the Father; and therefore we conceive and speak of him as the same person: even as a man and his spirit, though often distinctly spoken of by personal

\* See Scripture Sufficiency, p. 5, 6, 9, 10.

† Poole's Annotations on Luke i. 17.



characters, are still to be considered as one and the same individual person, see Rom. i. 9. Col. ii. 5. "—Among those who grant the Spirit to be a person, it is debated whether he be the *same philosophical person* with the Father, or *another distinct* from him: to suppose the latter (supposing him at the same time equal with the Father) is making him *another God* \*.

C. L. "Baptism, is a solemn act of religious worship, is commanded to be performed in his (the Spirit's) name, as well as in the names of the Father, and the Son," p. 22.

Ans. The form of christian baptism † doth not declare (neither in express words nor by necessary consequence) that we thereby devote ourselves to God in three persons, much less to three equal persons. That the Father and Son are two persons is certain, and that they are unequal persons is as certain from Matt. xxviii. 18. else the Son would never have said, that "all power was GIVEN unto him." But the *proper spirit* of either of these persons will not make a third; for though Peter and Paul be two distinct persons; yet Peter, and Paul, and the spirit of Paul, are not therefore three persons. But as God had promised the Holy Spirit in consequence of the resurrection and intercession of his Son Jesus Christ, unto those that should believe on his name, it was proper that converts to christianity should be baptized into *that faith*; and therefore the Spirit is mentioned in the form of baptism, and this, I think, is evident from John vii. 39. Acts i. 5. ii. 4, 18, 39. xix. 2, 3, 4. Eph. i. 13, 14.

C. L. "If there are three persons in God, as appears to us evident for the reasons before given, it is natural to expect that Jehovah will be found in scripture speaking of himself, or spoken of, in such a manner as includes a plurality, as in Gen. i. 26. *And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness, &c.* see also Gen. iii. 22. xi. 7. and Isa. vi. 1—9. the pronouns *I* and *he* discover unity, or that there is but one God, one divine Being; but the pronoun *us*, conveys the idea of a plurality," p. 23, 24.

Ans. We allow that the above texts, together with Isa. xli. 21—23, &c. speak of a plurality, but we deny that the plurality (if personal) is referable to God, because the scripture uniformly speaks of Jehovah as of one single person, Isa. xlv. 18—23. and testifies that *HE* is but one, † Mal. ii. 10. Mark xii. 29, 32. 1 Cor. viii. 6.—The reason why the scripture sometimes makes use of plural personal characters, *verbs* or *pronouns* where it speaks of God, or represents God as speaking to men, is, I think, plainly this, viz. because Jehovah had another person always with him: this is evident from Prov. viii. 22—36. when therefore he either spake to that person, or that person spake to him, as in Gen. i. 26. Isa. vi. 8. or when Jehovah spake to the church by that person, as in Exod. iii. 2, 4, 10. compared with Acts vii. 30, 31, 35. still the plural pronouns, &c. are always meant and intended of those two persons, that is, of Jehovah and his Christ, and are never designed to express any plurality of Jehovah by himself alone. But the Father and the Son, God and his Christ, are certainly two proper and distinct persons, or Beings; and this is so manifest that I need only refer to a few more texts as a clear proof and full demonstration of it, see Psalm ii. 2, &c. Isa. l. 5—9. John i. 1, 2. viii. 17, 18,

\* Doddridge's Lectures, p. 396.

† See Matt. xxviii. 19. explained at large, in *Divine Revelation*, p. 150—160.

‡ See *Divine Revelation*, p. 190.



28, 29. xiv. 23, Gal. iii. 17, 20. now, in all these texts, 'tis plain that two distinct persons are mentioned, and but one of them is the living God; for the other is declared to be his *Son*, his *Word*, his *Christ*: And from these two persons, and these only Paul constantly wishes, and prays for grace and peace, in his epistles which he sent, to all the churches, and he never calls but one of them God, and THAT ONE is the FATHER, see Rom. i. 7. 1 Cor. i. 3, &c. &c. and by the way, the NEW TESTAMENT is the only certain and faithful expositor of the Old.

2. The texts referred to in Dan. iv. 13, 14, 17: do not necessarily speak of more than two persons, and to me it is doubtful whether they be not created angels, ch. v. 8. does not prove the contrary, for what the holy angels speak by the command and authority of God, that very thing God himself is said to speak, see Acts xxvii. 23, 25. and Exod. xix. 19. xx. 1, 2, 19. compared with Acts vii. 53. Gal. iii. 19. Heb. ii. 2. Now from these scriptures, it seems to me, clear and certain, that the words of the law were spoken of GOD, by the medium and ministration of angels; and that the Lord Christ, the *Angel of the Covenant*, was also present and among them, is, I think, evident, from Psalm lxviii. 17. and Acts vii. 38.

3. You allow that God is but *one* DIVINE BEING, and by granting this, you seem to contradict all that you have said about a trinity of persons in the one JEHOVAH, for certainly *two* or *three* DIVINE PERSONS, must be more than one DIVINE BEING: a trinitarian writer, in a periodical paper, is much more rational and consistent when he tells us, that "*the uncreated and eternally begotten Son of the ALMIGHTY FATHER*," is, and must be as truly a DIVINE BEING, as the FATHER who begat "*him*." This writer therefore seems to hold and teach, that there are more *divine Beings* than one, that is, *more Gods than one*.—And, unless you make use of words without ideas, yourselves also must believe and teach the very same doctrine; nor does it, in the least, alter the case, whether you suppose them to be of the *same* or *different* natures, for it is indisputably clear and certain, that every intelligent person is an intelligent Being, and every distinct divine person, is a distinct divine spirit, or a distinct God. You have likewise told us that the pronouns *I* and *he* discover unity, or that there is but *one* GOD, *one* DIVINE BEING; but these pronouns are notes of *personality*, as yourselves allow and maintain; therefore by your own rule of interpretation, and by your own confession, GOD, the DIVINE BEING, is but *one person*: and when, on the contrary, you say they are *three* persons, you undoubtedly make them *three* BEINGS, or *three* GODS. But inconsistency is a known characteristic of your hypothesis. The text in 1 John v. 7. hath been, I think, plainly proved not to be authentic, especially by Sir Isaac Newton, in his excellent letter to Le clerk on that controverted text; but were its authenticity admitted, it would contribute nothing towards the support of your system.

C. L. "Had he (Christ) not been a divine person, he could not have atoned for sin, & none of them can by any means redeem his brother, &c. Psalm xlix. 7, 8." p. 26.

Ans. "There is *one* GOD, and *one* MEDIATOR between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all," 1 Tim. ii. 5. "for as *by man* came death, *by man* also came the resurrection from the dead," 1 Cor. xv. 21. "for if through the offence

\* Gospel Magazine for July, 1776.

† See Scripture Testimony, p. 60, 64.

‡ See the weakness and error of this objection fully laid open in *Sacred Controversy*, p. 38—50.

" of *one* many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift  
 " by grace, which is by *one man*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto  
 " many," Rom. v. 15.

2. —The passage referred to in the Psalms is quite foreign to the point, for it intirely respects a man's redeeming his brother, by virtue of his riches, from a temporal death, as must be manifest to every attentive reader—but *we* were "not redeemed *with corruptible things* as silver and gold, but with the *precious blood* of Christ."—"No satisfaction can be made unto the glory of God for sin, but in the nature itself that sinned, for whereas God gave the law unto man, as an effect of his wisdom and holiness, which he transgressed in his disobedience, wherein could the glory of them be exalted if the same law were fulfilled by a nature of *another* kind? wherefore there would be a veil drawn over the glory of God, in giving his law unto men, if it were not fulfilled in the *same nature*. Nor can there be any such relation between the obedience and sufferings of *one nature*, in the stead, and for the disobedience of *another*, as that glory might ensue unto the wisdom, holiness, and justice of God in the deliverance of that *other nature*, thereon—no otherwise could our ruin be retrieved, nor our deliverance from sin be effected, which came *by man*, but *by man*, by *one of the same nature* with us\*." I own this truly learned, and great divine, afterwards contradicts and denys it all, as is usual with the trinitarian writers; yet that which accords with the divine word, I read, and receive with pleasure.

C. L. "Without the consideration of the personal divinity of the Son, &c. the scriptures, instead of leading in a plain path, involve the attentive reader in perpetual perplexity—is the enquiry about worship? he finds it written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve—but of the Son he saith, *let all the angels of God worship him*, Heb. i. 6." p. 29, 30.

Ans. Not the scripture, but the strained expositions, and corrupt glosses of men upon it, are the occasion of the attentive reader's perplexity. But they who compare spiritual things with spiritual, and interpret one scripture by another, laying aside the traditions and vain reasonings of men; such persons, I am persuaded, will not be long in doubt, and perplexity, concerning this matter; especially if, with uprightness of heart, divested of the *flavish* fear of men, they *pray to be led into all truth, and seek the honor that cometh from God only*—It is written, "there is *none good* but *one God*;" and there is "*none holy* but the *Lord*," Matt. xix. 17. Rev. xv. 4. Yet, as the same scripture witnesseth, there are both *holy angels* and *good men*, Mark viii. 38. Luke xviii. 50. consequently that which in a *strict* and *absolute sense* is true of the most HIGH God alone; may, in a *lower* and *subordinate sense*, be also affirmed of other beings besides God. Therefore, also, that service, honor, and worship, which is *supreme*, and which belongs and is given to the *true God* only; may also, and ought in *another respect*, and in a *lower sense*, to be given to other beings, besides God, when we have *his word and commandment* for it. Now we know that the true God hath commanded both men and angels, to serve and worship his Son Jesus Christ, our Lord: this worship therefore cannot be *supreme* but must be *subordinate*, † nor can it be presumption for any one *thus* to

\* Dr. Owen, on the person of Christ, as published by Mr. Wesley in his Christian Library, vol. 18. p. 212.

† See this defended by Mr. Hervey in his Letters, vol. 1. p. 136, 137. and enlarged in *Sacred Controversy*, p. 26—37.

worship the Son of God, because we have a *divine warrant*, and authority for it—and they who do it not must answer for themselves. But it may be asked, is this *subordinate worship*, which we say is due to Christ, *civil or religious*? not civil, but religious; for all *civil acts* are indifferent in their own nature, and *may, or may not be done, without sin*. But *whatever is founded on a DIVINE COMMAND is religious*; it is *divinely binding*, nor can it be omitted without sin. And this, I apprehend, is the only true difference between a *civil and religious act*. If God command us to honor, worship, and obey any *superior*, whom He hath set over us, it becomes our duty; and the performance of it, is a part of our religion. Therefore servants who willingly and faithfully obey their masters, according to the flesh, are said to *serve the Lord Christ*, and to *do the will of God*, because he hath commanded it, Eph. vi. 5. &c. Col. iii. 22—25. consequently all subordinate reverence and worship, that is founded on a divine command, is religious. Again; 'tis certain that other beings are said to be worshipped in scripture besides the true God, see 1 Chron. xxix. 20. Psalm lxxii. 9. Isa. xlix. 23. Rev. iii. 9. and I hope no christian will presume to say, or even imagine, that the scripture commands and authorizes idolatry: consequently *inferior and subordinate worship is lawful*; for 'tis certain that *supreme worship* cannot be given to any Being (without sin) except the TRUE GOD only: and therefore he saith, "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve," i. e. thou shalt worship and serve no other Being *supremely*, and as the *true God*, except JEHOVAH only; nor any other Being with subordinate worship *without having his command and authority for it*—the apostles never worshipped Christ as the living God, but as the Son of God, and as him whom God had made both Lord and Christ, nor did Christ require or receive any other worship from them. See Matt. xiv. 33. John ix. 35—38. xiii. 13.

2. When we are commanded to worship the Son of God, and to fall down before the Lamb, there is a plain reason given for it, viz. because he was obedient unto death, and because he redeemed us to God by his blood; the ground therefore of that worship which is *distinctly* given to Christ, is *peculiar* to himself, it belongs to him only; it cannot be given to God, nor to Christ, *as God*, because God hath not, nor could die for us: yet it redounds to the glory of God *by him*, for God hath both *given* his Son to die for us, and hath now exalted him to be our Lord and Saviour; so that this worship must needs be paid to the *man Christ Jesus*, and consequently is *subordinate*, for it is evidently founded on his having laid down his life for the church, and on the commandment which God hath given for it. Dr. Owen, before-mentioned, hath ventured to go a step further, for he tells us, that "the *human nature* of Christ, in his divine person, and *together with it*, is the object of *divine adoration and worship*—but no other *creature* (he adds) either is, or can be exalted into such a condition of glory as," &c. Is not this *deifying a creature* in the strictest and fullest sense of the terms? Yet this divine had said before, "it implies a *contradiction* that any *creature* should, upon any account, be the proper object of *divine worship*." Now to worship any *nature, person, or Being, together with, or besides JEHOVAH, with the very same, or equal worship*, with that which is given to JEHOVAH, is, I think, a species of idolatry; but *subordinate worship*, which is authorized both by scripture precept and example can have nothing of the nature of idolatry in it.

\* Owen, on the person of Christ, Christian Library, vol. 18. p. 130, 224.



C. L. "*Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, He is the LORD GOD of Israel—who spake by the mouth of his holy prophets,*" Luke i. 68, 70." p. 32.

Ans. The God of Israel saith to Christ, *thou art my Son*, Psalm ii. 7. the God of Israel, also, who spake by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us, *by his Son*, Heb. i. 1. And again, the God of Israel, hath glorified *his Son Jesus*, Acts iii. 13. Now from all those texts it evidently appears, that the God of Israel is but one single person. But these ministers here tell us, that the Holy Spirit is the God of Israel, consequently they make the Holy Spirit to be the proper Father of Christ; and yet, at the same time, they are zealous in maintaining that the Spirit personally is not the Father, but another person distinct from him. But if Christ had not *two divine Fathers*, which he certainly had not, it plainly follows, that these Gentlemen have not understood and spoken the truth of the holy scripture.

2. JEHOVAH, the God of Israel, promises and gives his Holy Spirit, both to *Christ*, and the church: For, speaking of the Son, he saith, "I have put *my Spirit* upon him." And again, "*the Spirit of JEHOVAH shall rest upon him*:"—And to the church he saith, "I will *pour my Spirit* upon thy seed."—And again, David praying to the God of Israel, saith, "take not *thy Holy Spirit* from me;" but the sense of those texts, according to the divines, is this, *the spirit of the spirit* shall rest upon him, &c. &c. But such absurdities are no where to be met with in the sacred writings.—JEHOVAH is the *divine Being*, personally subsisting, as the above scriptures evidently declare, and *his Spirit* must needs stand in a proper relation to him: For if *improperly*, then the Spirit is another person *distinct* from Jehovah, which is the Arians doctrine; but if *properly* then it evidently means his vital energy and power; and this best agrees with the scripture account of the Spirit, which is said to be *poured* out upon Christ and his Church, that God might both dwell and walk in them, by his own Spirit. Now when the holy prophets and apostles were inspired with this divine Spirit, or breath; they were led and moved to speak the words of God, with understanding and boldness: and this is that *power from on high*, which Christ promised to send them from his Father, Luke xxiv. 43. and therefore the *Holy Spirit* is called, not the HIGHEST, but the *power* of the HIGHEST; not JEHOVAH the LIVING GOD, but the *Spirit* of JEHOVAH and the *Spirit* of the LIVING GOD; and for this reason also, Christ is not the Son of the Holy Spirit, though he was *begotten* of the *Holy Spirit*; because the Spirit is not a *proper person*, but the quickning influence of God, which Spirit, therefore, whoever receives, is thereby made a partaker of the *divine nature*: but were the spirit a proper person, then the spirit itself, and the spirit alone, would have been the proper Father of Christ, for 'tis certain Christ cannot have *two* distinct divine Fathers. Therefore the Spirit is not a proper person in God, but an essential power and property of God; nor can this, I think, be denied, but by denying Christ to be the true Son of the MOST HIGH GOD, or else affirming that the Son of God had *two* divine Fathers personally distinct from each other; which appear to be a plain contradiction both to reason and revelation, and are therefore to be rejected by us.

C. L. "The apostle (1 Cor. viii. 6) does not call the Father God to the exclusion of the Son and Spirit, nor the Son Lord to the exclusion of the Father, &c. for our Lord is frequently called God, and the Father and Holy Ghost Lord: of the Father it is said, the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ

"—NOW



"—now the Lord is that Spirit, but he speaks in opposition to the  
 "Gentiles who had gods many and lords many," p. 31.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. Had the apostle intended what these gentlemen here assert, he, as a wise and faithful minister of God, would doubtless have told us so, and would probably have expressed himself in the following manner, "to us there is but one God, and one Lord, even the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." For *this is the sense*, and the *only sense* which these Gentlemen have put upon the text. But we believe that Paul had a very different meaning, because his words evidently declare it.—I cannot find, that the Holy Spirit is called Lord, in any one text throughout the Bible, 2 Cor. iii. 17. does by no means prove it; for 'tis very improbable the apostle would have said, "*the Lord is that Spirit*," had he intended it of the *Holy Spirit*, unless the Spirit had been *commonly called* and generally known by the term *Lord*, which, as I think, all allow, he certainly is not. Had he therefore intended it of the Spirit, he would probably have said, *now the Holy Spirit is that Lord*: therefore by the term *Lord* he undoubtedly meant some other person, whom he was wont so to call, and who was generally known among the christian churches, by that name: and it is certain that Christ is the person who is most commonly called Lord, both by Paul and the other apostles: and that he meant it of Christ here, is, I think, plain from the context; for he is expressly mentioned ver. 14. and again is called Lord in ver. 16. so that he must certainly intend the same person in ver. 17. and who indeed is *the spirit*, and *substance*, and *end of the law*, but Christ? and to whom do men turn, as the *way* to God, but to Christ? and who but Christ is made a quickning spirit, and a head of vital influence to the church? into whose image also believers are said to be changed, ver. 18. and therefore to me it is exceeding clear that Christ is the person intended by the apostle in ver. 17. and hence, in the last verse, he is again called, *the Lord the Spirit*: besides, 'tis very unreasonable to suppose, that the Holy Spirit, who is so often mentioned in scripture, should be never called *Lord*, and *our Lord*, in plain terms, if he be so in reality; for in every text adduced by our opponents in favor of their opinion, the name *Lord* may as well, if not with greater propriety, be understood of Christ, who is constantly so called by the apostles, for "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, and therefore, *He is Lord of all*."

3. Neither are the words God, and Father to be taken for the *abstract essence* of Deity (as some unwarrantably assert); for nothing can be more plain, than that the *true* God is represented, and spoken of by all the apostles, as *one* single proper person: *ὁ θεός* doth as properly declare and strictly mean *one* God, or *one divine person* only; as *ὁ ἀνθρώπος* *one man*, or *one human person* only—'tis likewise evident that the *one* God, even the FATHER, is set in direct *opposition* to the *gods many*; and the *one* Lord JESUS CHRIST, in direct *opposition* to the *lords many*, which the apostle had mentioned in the preceding verse—we allow that the Father is called Lord, but never in the sense in which Christ is called Lord. Christ is made both KING of kings, and LORD of lords, Psalm ii. 6. Acts ii. 36. Christ is likewise our Head, and so is God; but not in the same sense, as Christ is; for God is both the Head of the church, and of Christ too: every greater, in point of dominion, includes the less. As God then hath made Christ our Lord and head, certainly GOD HIMSELF must be both the LORD and HEAD of Christ: and therefore he addressed his FATHER as the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth. Christ then is here spoken of, and called Lord, in a sense peculiar to himself; consequently the

the Father is here also called God in a *sense peculiar to himself*. But, you say, the apostle opposes them to the Gentiles, who had gods many, and lords many; were this admitted (which in part is the truth but not the whole truth), it would not justify your exposition: for as the Gentiles did not suppose *their gods and their lords*, to be one and the same Being, nor co-equal persons; but the latter to be inferior, and mediators between them and their chief deities, there would have been no propriety in the apostles opposing to them, the one TRUE GOD and the one TRUE LORD, if your sense of the words be admitted: but there is both propriety and truth according to our sense of them; because we consider the apostle as speaking, not of the very same Being, nor of co-equal persons. I infer, therefore, that the apostle doth certainly oppose the one God, and the one Lord, not to heathen idols merely, but to all other beings both in heaven and earth, whereby he declares and testifies that the christian's God is but one person even the FATHER, of whom are all things: and the christian's Lord and Mediator, is but one person even JESUS CHRIST, by whom are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen.

---

## P O S T S C R I P T.

I Have the pleasure to inform my christian friends, who know and love us in the faith of Jesus, the Son of God; that one of our most active opposers (a person of no mean abilities), who but last year published a *two shilling pamphlet* against us, entitled, *The TRIUMPH OF TRUTH, &c.* hath seen the error of his former sentiments, and renounced them publicly.—But there are other more pompous publications, that have lately appeared in support of the trinitarian cause; and although *their arguments*, as to the nature and substance of them, don't materially differ from those of the CIRCULAR LETTER; yet as they are mightily applauded, and strongly recommended by some of their own party; it is, I conceive, both seasonable, and proper, to make a few strictures on those celebrated performances; whereby the reader may be able to form some judgment of the fallacy of their reasonings, and of their strange manner of expounding the sacred scriptures—the first of these is an 8vo vol. of 400 pages\*.

*HORÆ SOLITARIE.* "It is commonly understood, that it was God the FATHER—who appeared to *Abraham*, to *Moses*, to the prophets; when we have the authority of *Christ* himself and his apostles to pronounce, that it was the *second* person in *JEHOVAH* alone," p. 7. 9.

\* This publication is anonymous, entitled *Horæ Solitariae, or ESSAYS upon some remarkable NAMES and TITLES of JESUS CHRIST*. The encomium passed upon it in the Gospel Magazine for Jan. 1777, is expressed in the following words:—"Without partiality, and without rashness, be it said; that this performance may class with the most learned, the most masterly, and most evangelical treatises, which the present age has seen."—We naturally expect that one trinitarian will commend another, but to exaggerate in his praises, is often a mark of rashness, if not of partiality; and if I mistake not, this work, though *learned*, is very far from deserving so high a character.

Ans. The scripture no where speaks of a *second* person in JEHOVAH. The living God who appeared to *Abraham, Moses, &c.* was no *second* person, but GOD the FATHER himself; yet he did appear *alone*, nor was he *seen* by them, but he appeared *in* Christ, and spake *by* him: for we are assured that THE GOD *who appeared to Abraham, made a covenant with him in* CHRIST, Gal. iii. 17. therefore that God was not Christ himself—Moreover, the same God that afterwards appeared to Moses, promised to raise up a prophet (*viz. Christ*) like unto Moses, Deut. xviii. 15—19. Christ therefore was not that God who appeared to Moses.—The apostles also, with one consent, declare and testify, that the GOD of Abraham, and of the holy prophets, is not the SON, but the FATHER, see Acts iii. 13, 26. Rom. i. 1, 3. Heb. i. 1.

H. S. "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto GOD by him, seeing HE EVER LIVETH [the very meaning of his name JEHOVAH] to make intercession for them, Heb. vii. 25. And Jesus is JEHOVAH or he could not be THE SAME yesterday [i. e. from eternity] to day [i. e. through all time] and forever [i. e. to eternity] all which the name JEHOVAH implies." p. 96.

Ans. We have here a specimen of our authors abilitys as an *expositor*—because Jesus *ever liveth*, as a priest, to intercede for them that come to God by him; he therefore infers, Jesus must be that JEHOVAH, who made him priest, and with whom he intercedes: strange reasoning! But 'tis manifest from the text itself, that Jehovah is not the *person interceding*, but the *person to whom* Christ prays and makes intercession; consequently Christ is not Jehovah.

2. If our author be not the first, I hope he will be the last, who shall venture to assert, that by *yesterday* is meant *eternity*; for it evidently means, and only means, a *limited portion of time*, which, both had a beginning, and also an end,—“The evening and the morning were the *first day*,” Gen. i. 5. “*Before the day was*, I am HE,” Isa. xliii. 13. “We are but of *yesterday*, and know nothing,” Job viii. 9. “A *thousand years* in thy sight are but as *yesterday when it is past*, Psalm xc. 4.

3. Our author, in another place, having cited Isa. xxxv. 4. 5. xliii. 3. xlv. 6. xlv. 15, 21. xlviii. 17, &c. in order to prove that Christ is JEHOVAH SABAOth, or the LORD of Hosts, &c. he, with a kind of triumph, adds, “CHRIST JESUS, then, let all men know assuredly, is both JEHOVAH and ALMIGH,” p. 111.

To which I need only reply in the words of an apostle, “Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ,” Acts ii. 36. If then the apostle's doctrine be not false, this Gentleman's cannot be true; for they stand in direct opposition to one another; and from hence also it evidently appears, that JEHOVAH of hosts, is not the Son, but the FATHER.—Our learned Author, likewise, with uncommon confidence, refers us, and that often, to divers scripture texts, in order to prove the direct contrary of what those texts *expressly* declare; for instance, in p. 204, he refers us to 2 Cor. i. 21, as a proof that Christ is the true God who anointed his people—and in p. 350, he refers us to Rev. xi. 15, 17. xii. 10. to prove that Christ, is the Lord God almighty: when the very reverse is manifest from the texts themselves.

I shall give but one specimen more of our Author's judgment and abilitys as an *expositor*.—After, having found fault with the commonly received, and obvious meaning of 1 Cor. i. 30. he *paraphrases* it thus—“of him (the whole Godhead) are ye in Christ Jesus, i. e. ye are saved by the grace and love of the three persons in JEHOVAH through the mediation

"mediation of the God man, *who* of God, or from the Godhead, in which he exists as a *person*, is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness," &c. p. 134.—Reader what thinkest thou? were not the apostle's words plain and easy to be understood, before the above *paraphrast* had made them dark and unintelligible; yet this pretended corrector of the mistakes of others, can treat his opposers with no small degree of insolence and contempt.

H. S. "Some derive AL (God) from a root which signifies *strength* or *power*; and others, from a word which implies *interposition*, *mediation*, or *intervention*—*who* is AL but JEHOVAH, 2 Sam. xxii. 32. If, then, "there be no AL but JEHOVAH; and if the word AL be ever applied to CHRIST, it is an incontestible proof that CHRIST is JEHOVAH," p. 99. 100.

Answ. There be other ALS besides JEHOVAH, as the scripture testifies, *angels* and *princes* are so called, Psalm xxix. 1. lxxxix. 6. the king of Babylon is called the AL of the heathen, Ezek. xxxi. 11. whose arms, saith Jehovah, I will strengthen, and into whose hands I will put my sword, xxx. 25. therefore your argument proves nothing; for when Jehovah is called the *only* AL, it evidently means that HE is the SUPREME in power, having all power essentially in himself: and hence, to point out the *distinction* between him and all other ALS, JEHOVAH is called the LIVING AL, Hosea i. 10. and the MOST HIGH, or *high* AL, Gen. xiv. 18. plainly implying there are other ALS besides him, but none of them are to be compared with JEHOVAH, or are *equal* with him. Again; Jehovah likewise saith, I am ALM (God) there is none else, Isa. xlv. 21, xlv. 9. but the same scripture assures us, there are other *alms*, God's many, Psalm lxxxii. i. John x. 34, 35. therefore when these names are restrained to Jehovah, it only means that he alone is *absolutely* GOD, the SUPREME, GOD *above* all, and hence HE is addressed as, *God of gods*.

H. S. "He (Christ) must be equal to the FATHER and the SPIRIT, "that he might suggest his counsels; and *they* must be equal to him, "that they might concur in them. Infinite wisdom can receive no "communication from a wisdom less than infinite," p. 168.

Answ. Here our Author plainly makes *three* EQUALS, and *three* INFINITES, i. e. *three distinct* and *supreme* GODS; whom he also represents as counselling one another. How contrary is all this both to reason and revelation: "with whom took HE counsel?" and of the same JEHOVAH it is written, "HE worketh all things after the counsel of *his own* will. But to affirm, of any person that he *receives* communication of wisdom from another, is as much as to say, that person is not infinite in wisdom. Our Author therefore greatly eclipses the glory of the MOST HIGH GOD; for "it is a much greater glory to be the HIGHEST of all "beings, than to be only *one* of a number of *equals*; now this supremacy of God would be destroyed by the supposition of an equal, "especially when it is considered, that no one can say how many there "might be, for we might allow two millions as well as two—there "is no reason from the light of nature to conclude, that there are "more Deities than one, or indeed to *imagine* there are any more; "since *one* ALMIGHTY and ALL-WISE Being can do as much as a "thousand such beings can do."

H. S. "If Christ be the EVERLASTING FATHER, and if *there* is but "one GOD the Father; then, Christ being GOD, that divine person,



"who is *aeconomically* and usually styled the *Father*, must be of one essence with him, or there would be *two Gods*," p. 183.

Ans. Our Author generally speaks as an Athanasian, but here he seems to espouse the Hutchinsonian doctrine; for I know of none but *Hutchinsonians* and *Sabellians*, that consider the *character* of FATHER as *aeconomical*, when applied to proper DEITY, and then it always means one person, and cannot, with truth, be predicated of any other: but, if we believe our Author, *Christ* is called *Father*, and JEHOVAH the FATHER, in Psalm lxviii. 4. 5. Isa. lxiii. 16. Mal. ii. 10. and, for a further proof of his doctrine, he even refers us to what is commonly called the *Lord's Prayer*. But the inspired writers of the New Testament have not so much as once called *Christ*, or the Holy Spirit, GOD the FATHER, or OUR FATHER, which doubtless they would have done, had they known either of them to have been so. And I suppose it will be allowed, that our Author, however learned, doth not understand either the language, or style, or doctrine of the holy prophets, better than the apostles; if then the apostles constantly call one person, and *one only*, the FATHER, and *our FATHER*, and expressly call that person the *LIVING* GOD, and the GOD of Israel, and the GOD and FATHER of our *Lord Jesus Christ*: our Author's doctrine is certainly erroneous, full of darkness and confusion; but that of the apostles is divinely true and clear, and easy to be understood; and from hence it also follows that *Christ, as God*, is never called, *Father*.

H. S. "It shall suffice to use one argument, taken from this idea of *strength*, used in the scriptures, to prove the divinity of the Lord Redeemer.

"The Psalmist says, JEHOVAH ADONAI, is the *STRENGTH* of salvation, Psalm cxl. 7.

"The Evangelist affords us the assumption: CHRIST is an *HORN* (a well known Hebraism for *strength*) of *salvation*; Luke i. 69. and *none other*, Acts iv. 12. CHRIST, therefore, is JEHOVAH ADONAI, or the saving and omnipotent GOD," p. 350.

Ans. An answer is contained in the very texts themselves to which we are here referred, "The *LORD* GOD of Israel hath *raised up* an *horn* of salvation for us," Luke i. 68, 69. *Jesus Christ*, whom GOD raised from the dead, is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, neither is there salvation in any other. *for, &c.* Acts iv. 10, 11, 12. One would think that our Author seldom read the New Testament, or that he very little regarded the apostle's doctrine, which is so directly contrary to his own: for JEHOVAH ADONAI, the GOD of Israel, of whom the Psalmist speaks, is evidently declared, both by the apostles and evangelists, to be another different person, and *Being* from *Christ*, whom JEHOVAH hath *raised up*, and *given* to be a Savior for us.

H. S. "If the *Father* suffered upon the cross, *how* and *to whom* could he say, *my GOD, my GOD, why hast THOU forsaken me?* If he were the *Father*, or the *whole* Godhead; he could not forsake, or be forsaken of himself," p. 390.

Ans. This kind of reasoning will equally hold good, and is as forcible against the *Trinitarians*, as the *Sabellians*—if JEHOVAH in *any person* suffered upon the cross, to whom could he say *my GOD, &c.* if *Christ* be *Jehovah*, as this Author maintains, he could not *for-sake*, or *be forsaken of himself*, in either case the absurdity is glaring, and the supposition impious. But if the man *Christ* only suffered upon the cross, and he was now for a little moment forsaken by *his* GOD and FATHER, who had all along dwelt in him, and supported him; then there was propriety

propriety, and truth in that distressing exclamation, *my God, my God, why hast THOU forsaken me?*

But I proceed, in the last place, to make a few observations on the *newly republished, and celebrated treatise* of Dr. ABBADIE—we allow that the Dr's. style, in general, is elegant; and several of his arguments against the Socinians, in defence of the *pre-existence* of Christ, and of the *vicious sacrifice* of his death, are excellent.—But his method is too scholastic and obscure for common readers; and, in my opinion, he is very far from being a *clear and fair reasoner*—nor is he *always consistent* with himself—He is *subtle, overbearing, and evasive*; and, in some places, is no better than a downright *wrangler*, as if he contended not for truth, but victory.—If Mr. Booth can make it appear, that I have mistaken the Doctor, or mis-represented him, I will retract the charge, for I mean not to wrong any man.—But let us consider two or three of the *chief texts*, and examine a few of the *arguments*, whereon the Doctor builds, and whereby he endeavors to support his *hypothesis*.

Dr. ABBADIE. "That angel (in Exod. iii. 2) was a divine person, "the true God," p. 72.

Ans. The Doctor lays great stress on this text, for he urges it again and again, but he hath evidently mistaken its meaning; for we are assured by an inspired writer, that the God of Abraham sent Moses into Egypt, *by the hand or ministration of the angel* that appeared to him, see Acts vii. 30—35. Therefore the *angel*, and JEHOVAH were two *distinct* beings; and JEHOVAH, *not the angel*, is declared to be the TRUE GOD—Neither is the TRUE GOD ever called an angel, for all the angels are ministering spirits, Heb. i. 14. And even Christ himself, the Angel of the Covenant, is Jehovah's messenger; for he testifies that *he came down from heaven, not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him*. John vi. 38.—Therefore every angel of God, differs from God, just as the person *sent* differs from him that *sends* him.

Dr. Ab. "THE GREAT GOD, is another of his (Christ's) divine titles," p. 244.

Ans. The Doctor wishes to establish his sense of Tit. ii. 13. from his profound knowledge of the Greek language; but his criticism is indefensible, and his argument built upon it inconclusive, see in the original, Acts xv. 22. Rev. xix. 17. the true sense of Tit. ii. 13. we have given in p. 15, 16.—Again; the Dr. being an acute *logician*, and a *subtle disputant*, endeavors to overturn also, the obvious sense of John xvii. 3. Here, as a *critic*, he tries his utmost skill, and labors hard at it, for he employs above 20 pages in order to prove that Christ is the TRUE GOD, and not the FATHER *only*. for according to our Author the text should be read thus, "that they may know thee the only true God, and that Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, is the true God, with thee." Thus our Author would evidently make, *more true Gods* than *one*; for his words plainly declare, that *one true God* was sent, by *another true God*.

But the Doctor asserts, that the *analogy of language*, as well as the verb *know*, require, that the TRUE GOD, should be understood in the *last member* of the proposition: we believe, and maintain the contrary; neither hath the Doctor been able to make his assertion good; for the texts (viz. John xv. 4. 1 Cor. iv. 15.) which he hath cited in order to justify his *criticism*, are wholly impertinent, and foreign to the purpose. Can Mr. Booth deny this? Or is he able to defend the Doctor's sense of the text—Neither is the adverb *only* in 1 Cor. ix. 6. the *epithet* of Paul any more than that of Barnabas; for the words in the order of the original stand thus, or "only I and Barnabas, have not *we*," &c.

Therefore

Therefore, there is not the least resemblance between the construction of 1 Cor. ix. 6. and John xvii. 3.—Besides, that which is *predicated* of the FATHER in the *first-part* of the proposition, is evidently this, that HE is the only true God; and that which is *predicated* of JESUS CHRIST, in the *last part* of the proposition, is as plainly this, that he is the person whom the true God hath sent: Nor doth this *last part* need any other supply but that of the *verb*, in order, to make the sense clear and full; neither can it admit of any other, there being no room for it; for both the personal noun which the verb governs, and what is predicated of that person, are, in the last member of the proposition, distinctly, and fully expressed: therefore the Doctor's *criticism* and *addition*, is evidently forced, unnatural, and absurd. The Doctor indeed says, and only says, that the words, *whom thou hast sent*, do not alter the nature of the proposition, or are nothing to the purpose, but this, in my opinion, is an artful evasion, or else he was greatly mistaken—they are much to *our* purpose, tho' not to *his*; for they evidently declare that Christ is the person whom the true God hath sent, and whom we were to know, and believe on, *as such*: therefore they properly answer the question, What of Jesus Christ? What are we to know and believe of him? the answer is, that he was sent by the true God: and that this is the proper and only sense of the words, and what the disciples were to know and believe of Jesus Christ, is manifest from the whole chapter, especially from ver. 8, 21, 23, 25. where the great stress is laid on men's believing, *not that Christ was the TRUE GOD*, but that he was *sent* of the TRUE GOD, and did not come of himself; this text therefore is a clear and certain proof that the Father only is the true God.—His *criticism* on 1 Cor. viii. 6. is equally forced and *indefensible*; but at present I shall not trouble myself with it.

But the Doctor asserts, that Christ, in another place, is expressly called the true God, and refers us, for proof, to 1 John v. 20. yet he himself allows, that "nothing can be more evident, than that he who is called the TRUE GOD, is the same who is called *true*."—We, on that very ground, reply, that nothing can be more evident, than that he who is called the *true*, is the FATHER of him who is called the *Son*, for the text expressly says, "we are in him that is TRUE; *in* or by *his* Son."—And as there is but one true God; this text also is a direct proof that the Father alone is the true God. And here we may start on our opposers, surely "nothing but an extreme desire to defend their cause, at any rate, could induce them to assert" that these words, THE TRUE GOD, ought to be referred to the Son, and not to God the Father.—But *education* principles, *prejudices*, and *interest*, have a powerful, and too often a pernicious influence, on the minds of men; else the absurdities, and abominations of *pope* y would not have so generally, and so long prevailed, in the world. See p. 9.

Dr. Ab. "We have not the least intimation in scripture that God's knowledge of the heart is *immediate*, but that of Christ *mediate* or *by revelation*," p. 55.

Ans. The Father loveth the Son, and *sheweth* him all things—as my Father hath *taught* me I speak these things—the *revelation* of JESUS CHRIST which God *gave* unto him. The Doctor, then was certainly in an error, for what the scripture expressly asserts, he hath rashly denied.—Again; because Christ is said to *know all things*, therefore our Author infers, that Christ must be the OMNISCIENT GOD.—How very different was the reasoning of the apostles; for they *inferred* that Christ *knew all things because he came from God*, John xvi. 30. not because



he was THAT God from whom he came, and though Dr. Abbadie and Mr. Booth could digest so gross an absurdity; the apostles could not.

Dr. Ab. "When JESUS called himself the *first* and the *last*, he either applies the august characters in the *same* sense in which they were used by the prophet, or in one that is *different*," p. 62.

Ans<sup>r</sup> JESUS applies them in a *different* sense, without being chargeable with deceiving men, and leading them into idolatry, as our Author impiously asserts: for Jesus knew that he was the *beginning* of Jehovah's way, and the *first-born* of every creature; and that God had made all things by him, and for him, and had set him over the works of his hands, and had put all things under his feet. But JEHOVAH his Father, who did these things for him, was manifestly before him, and must be also above him: therefore Christ is the *first* and the *last* in one sense, and JEHOVAH in another—Ye are CHRIST'S, and Christ is GOD'S, 1 Cor. iii. 23. "For the head of every man is CHRIST, and the head of Christ is GOD," xi. 3.

To conclude; I have endeavored, thro' the whole of these remarks, to express my self with becoming freedom, and decency.—I have neither flattered, nor designedly offended any man—yet I seek to please, not men, but God.—If there be now and then an appearance of sharpness and reproof, it was because I thought that the Author's rashness and impiety required it.—I am not pleading my own cause—I firmly believe it to be the cause of God, and of his Christ, according to the holy scriptures: for it is my firm opinion that the love of God towards his church, in the gift of his Son; and the love of Christ, in giving himself for us, is exceedingly darkened, debased, and misrepresented by our opposers.—I pray and long for an increase of true knowledge, love, and holiness, among all professing christians—I am a man of no party—He that confesseth Jesus to be the Son of God, and sincerely loves, and follows him, in faith, and meekness, and purity; that person I count, and embrace, as my friend and my brother: and for all such I heartily pray with the apostle, that "*the FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ would grant unto them, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might, by his Spirit, in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith; and that they might be rooted and grounded in love, abounding therein with thanksgiving.*" "*Now unto HIM that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think—unto HIM be glory in the church, by JESUS CHRIST, throughout all ages worlds without end, AMEN.*"

F I N I S.



By the AUTHOR, Divine Revelation the only test, &c. 4s.  
 Scripture Sufficiency, 6d.  
 Sacred Controversy, 6d.  
 Scripture Testimony of Christ, 1s.  
 Volume of Hymns, Price bound, 2s.